

AD-A272 881



ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL
PROMOTION PREDICTORS

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

R. BRUCE HAVERTY, MAJ, USA
B.A., Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 1979



Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1993

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

93 11 16 066

93-28127

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE 4 June 1993	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Armor Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Predictors		5. FUNDING NUMBERS		
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJ R. Bruce Haverty, USA				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-6900		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; distribution is unlimited		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A		
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This study examines the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Board results to identify and rank-order predictors associated with selection and nonselection of armor majors for promotion to lieutenant colonel. The study revealed 13 predictors associated with selection and 10 predictors associated with nonselection to lieutenant colonel that met the .05 level of significance. These predictors were based on sanitized officer record brief data for the armor majors considered in the primary zone. The study compares the predictors with established Army policy contained in DA PAM 600-3, and the Secretary of the Army's "Selection Board Instructions" in force during FYs 1990-1992. The study found that the board results complied with Army policy in force during this period. This study also found that service as an operations officer (S3) or executive officer (XO) and a MEL 4 (military education level) education are requirements for promotion to lieutenant colonel. However, since promotion boards are not required to strictly follow the requirements in DA PAM 600-3, the study recommends that it be used as a vehicle to honestly articulate selection board requirements to officers in the field.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS DA PAM 600-3, armor lieutenant colonel promotions, branch qualification, field grade promotions			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 112	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

by

UNIC QUALITY INSPECTED 5

Accession For	
NTIS	ADAM
DIIC	140
Un	140
Jan	
By	
Ex	
Date	
A-1	

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: Major R. Bruce Haverty

Title of Thesis: Armor Lieutenant Colonel Promotion
Predictors: Did the Fiscal Years 1990-1992 Lieutenant
Colonel Promotion Selection Board Results Comply With
Established Army Policy?

Approved by:

Steven R. Lindberg, Thesis Committee
LTC Steven R. Lindberg, M.S. Chairman

Robert L. Crafton, Member
LTC Robert L. Crafton, B.S.

Bruce A. Leeson, Member, Consulting
MAJ Bruce A. Leeson, Ph.D. Faculty

Accepted this 4th day of June 1993 by:

Philip J. Brookes, Director, Graduate Degree
Philip J. Brookes, Ph.D. Programs

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of
the student author and do not necessarily represent the
views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or
any other governmental agency. (References to this study
should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL PROMOTION PREDICTORS by MAJ R. Bruce Haverty, USA, 112 pages.

This study examines the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Board results to identify and rank-order predictors associated with selection and nonselection of armor majors for promotion to lieutenant colonel. The study revealed 13 predictors associated with selection and 10 predictors associated with nonselection to lieutenant colonel that met the .05 level of significance. These predictors were based on sanitized officer record brief data for the armor majors considered in the primary zone.

The study compares the predictors with established Army policy contained in DA PAM 600-3, and the Secretary of the Army's "Selection Board Instructions" in force during FYs 1990-1992. The study found that the board results complied with Army policy in force during this period.

This study also found that service as an operations officer (S3) or executive officer (XO) and a MEL 4 (military education level) education are requirements for promotion to lieutenant colonel. However, since promotion boards are not required to strictly follow the requirements in DA PAM 600-3, the study recommends that it be used as a vehicle to honestly articulate selection board requirements to officers in the field.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express special appreciation to Mr. Tom Leet and the Armor Proponency Office, Fort Knox, Kentucky for providing data and technical assistance in this endeavor. Without their assistance this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	18
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	36
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	48
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	85
ENDNOTES	89
GLOSSARY	95
SOURCES CONSULTED	97
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	102

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Lieutenant Colonel Selectee Average Active Federal Commissioned Service	20
2. Lieutenant Colonel Selectee Average Age	20
3. Lieutenant Colonel Selectee Average Time-in-Grade	20
4. Lieutenant Colonel Selectee Military Education Level 4 Completion Rate	21
5. Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selects versus Nonselects, Military Education Level 4 Completion Source	23
6. Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selects versus Nonselects, Highest Civilian Degree Earned	24
7. Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selects versus Nonselects, Combat Experience	25
8. Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selects versus Nonselects, Time Since Last Troop Assignment	25
9. Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selects versus Nonselects, Company/Troop Command Experience	27
10. Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selects versus Nonselects, Operations/Executive Officer Experience	28
11. Promotion Timing and Opportunity Objectives	30
12. Study Population Sample Size	38
13. United States Military Academy Graduates	49

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
14. Reserve Officer Training Corps Non-Distinguished Military Graduates versus with All Other Commissioning Sources	51
15. Military Education Level 4 Program Completion	52
16. Nonresident versus Resident Military Education Level 4 Program Completion	53
17. Functional Area 41 versus All Other Functional Areas	56
18. Functional Area 49 versus All Other Functional Areas	57
19. Functional Area 92 versus All Other Functional Areas	58
20. Type of Organization Served in as a Company/Troop Commander	61
21. Line versus Headquarters Company/Troop Command Comparison	62
22. Company Command Tour Length	63
23. Operations/Executive Officer Experience	65
24. One versus Two Operations/Executive Officer Assignments	66
25. Type of Organization Served in as an Operations/Executive Officer	68
26. Operations/Executive Officer Tour Length	69
27. Total Months Served as an Operations/Executive Officer	70
28. Elapsed Time in Months Since Last Troop Assignment	71
29. Officers Currently Serving in Joint Assignments	73
30. Brigade Staff Experience	74

Table

Page

31. United States Military Academy Faculty and Staff Experience	77
32. Selectee Promotion Predictors	79
33. Nonselectee Predictors	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFCS	active federal commissioned service
AMSP	Advanced Military Studies Program
<u>AOPD</u>	<u>Armor Officer Professional Development Guide</u>
AZ	above the zone
BZ	below the zone
CGSOC	Command and General Staff Officer Course
CSC	command and staff college
DA	Department of the Army
DA PAM	Department of the Army Pamphlet
DCSPER	Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
DMG	Distinguished Military Graduate
DOD	Department of Defense
DOPMA	Defense Officer Personnel Management Act
encl.	enclosure
FA	functional area
FY	fiscal year
HHC	headquarters company (company used interchangeably with troop)
MAPP	Military Applications Program Package (a computer software program)
MEL 4	Military Education Level 4
MTOE	modified table of organization and equipment

NS	not selected
OCS	Officer Candidate School, Fort Benning, Georgia
OER	officer evaluation report
OPMS-II	Officer Personnel Management System-II
ORB	officer record brief
P	probability (used in expressing levels of statistical significance)
PYG	predominate year group
PZ	primary zone
RC	Reserve Component
ROTC	Reserve Officer Training Corps
SAMS	School of Advanced Military Studies
SP	study population
SP _d	sample population assignment duration
SP _{s3/xo}	sample population with service as an operations or executive officer
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (a computer software program)
std.	standard
S3/XO	operations or executive officer
TDA	table of distribution and allowance
TIG	time-in-grade
TRADOC	Training and Doctrine Command
USAREC	United States Army Recruiting Command
USMA	United States Military Academy
USAARMC	United States Army Armor Center

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Leadership skills are the most important, yet they are the most difficult to develop. While professional schools are important, the military is a hands-on profession and most learning by leaders at all levels is accomplished while participating in unit training and operations.

Purpose of the Study

This research proposes to identify and rank in order of relative importance the apparent common discriminators that the Fiscal Years (FY) 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards used to select armor majors for promotion and to determine if the board results matched Army policy. These discriminators, which are based on the promotion board results, form the criteria that armor majors must meet in order to be "best qualified to meet the needs of the Army"² These discriminators form the de facto branch qualification standards that armor majors must meet in order to be "best qualified."

Historical Background

Part of the restructuring effort toward a smaller Army is a reexamination of commissioned officer professional development. One of the key elements in this reexamination is the revision of Department of the Army Pamphlet

(DA PAM) 600-3, Commissioned Officer Professional

Development and Utilization. This document establishes the Army's commissioned officer professional development policy, which in turn directly influences officer assignment and promotion policies. DA PAM 600-3 serves three audiences: (1) selection boards use it as a guide to determine an officer's qualifications in his branch or functional area,³ (2) officers in the field and their mentors use it to chart their career paths and make career decisions based on the standard that selection boards will hold them to, and (3) U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM) assignment officers use it to determine the professional development needs of the officers they manage; place those officers in the jobs that best balance both the Army's and the officer's needs; and to provide sound advice to their officers as they make critical career decisions.⁴

One of the most controversial issues during the Army's reexamination of officer professional development has been the issue of branch qualification. The idea of a formal, prescriptive branch qualification standard for field grade officers, particularly majors, has been the subject of much debate within the senior leadership of the Army.

Current thought is that branch qualification consists of two measurable components: institutional training and operational assignments. While there seems to be a general consensus on the institutional training component, there is much disagreement on the operational

assignment portion of branch qualification. There is also disagreement on whether officers must continue to branch qualify at each rank or whether branch qualification at the rank of captain renders an officer permanently qualified in his or her branch. The primary reason for this disagreement pertains to concern over the opportunity to serve in certain specific operational assignments and the perceived fairness for the officer corps in this era of downsizing the Army.

There are those who would argue that a formal policy requiring field grade officers to serve in a specific type of operational assignment is discriminatory towards a segment of the officer corps. The rationale is that unless all officers can be provided the opportunity to serve in those required assignments, that the officers who were not provided the same opportunity will be placed at a disadvantage for promotion to the next rank through no fault of their own. Two examples of officers in this category are: (1) officers serving in critical non-branch qualifying positions who are not allowed to move to one that is branch qualifying due to the criticality of their current position, and (2) officers who are not allowed to move to another location or installation due to Army time-on-station requirements. However, it should also be noted that some officers choose not to serve in branch qualifying assignments within their branch because their interests lie in their functional area. In addition, a small segment of officers are denied the opportunity to serve in a branch

qualifying position because of poor performance in their current assignment.

The fairness issue also has Army readiness implications due to increased personnel turnover and unit turbulence. Since the Army is removing force structure at a faster rate than it is separating officers, there has been increased pressure to decrease tour lengths in branch qualifying assignments in order to provide more officers the opportunity to serve in them.⁵

These concerns have led to the policy of defining two tiers of branch qualifying assignments for field grade officers, "fully qualified"⁶ and "exceptionally qualified."⁷ Assignments in the fully qualified category are designed to provide virtually all officers the opportunity to serve in any one of those assignments. Exceptionally qualified assignments are more restrictive and are a subset of the fully qualified assignment group.

Selection Board Process

This section summarizes the pre-board preparation and five-phased board deliberation process. Institutional training, operational assignments, manner of performance, and DA PAM 600-3 are discussed within the framework of the selection process in order to gain an appreciation of their relative importance.

Pre-board Preparation⁸

Approximately thirty days from the board convene date, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel formally notifies officers by letters classified "close-hold" that they have been selected as a member of a selection board. PERSCOM policy requires representatives from each branch, former or serving battalion or brigade commanders, and several other requirements designed to provide a cross section of the officers in the Army.

Board members receive several briefings during the pre-board preparation to prepare them for the selection process. The recorder briefs the procedures contained in the selection board memorandum of instruction, things that board members should look for when reviewing an officer's file, and the scoring system to be used during the board. A PERSCOM representative briefs the board on the officer evaluation report (OER) rating system, the "center of mass" concept, and how to interpret an above, in, and below center of mass rating. Each board member briefs the other members of the selection board on unique branch and functional area career paths and requirements, based on their area of expertise, using DA PAM 600-3 as a guide. For example, the armor representative would brief the other board members on armor's typical career patterns and educational and assignment requirements.

Selection Board Deliberations

During the first phase, the selection board identifies the officers who are fully qualified in and above the zone of consideration. "By definition, fully qualified officers are those whose demonstrated potential unequivocally warrants their promotion to the next higher grade."⁹ The Secretary of the Army's "Selection Board Instructions" list the following indicators of potential for the selection to use in selecting officers for promotion: physical fitness and military bearing, military and civilian education, assignment history and professional development, performance and professional attributes.¹⁰

The board reviews each officer's file to determine the officer's potential for service at the next higher grade. Each officer's file receives a numerical score based on the board's evaluation of the officer's potential. The records are then arranged sequentially by score on a relative standing list without regard to selection requirements contained in the "Selection Board Instructions." From this list the selection board tentatively identifies the officers who are fully qualified for promotion.

During the second phase, the board identifies potential below the zone selectees. The process is similar to the first phase of the selection process. The board evaluates and scores the files, arrays the scores on a relative standing list, integrates the scores of potential

below the zone selectees into the standing list developed during phase one.

The third phase of the selection process identifies the officers who are fully qualified in career fields designated as a critical skill by the Secretary of the Army in the "Selection Board Instructions." The Secretary of the Army sets selection requirements or floors for these critical skills. Although many officers in this category will be selected under the best qualified method of selection, the selection board must promote the number of officers specified in the selection requirement, provided there are a sufficient number of fully qualified officers available.¹¹ (Officers not in a critical skill are promoted under the best qualified method of selection.) The board arrays the officers' scores on relative standing lists by critical skill in preparation for the next phase.

The fourth phase requires the board to identify the officers "best qualified to meet the needs of the Army" selection criterion¹² From the initial standing list developed at the end of the second phase, the board identifies the officers best qualified for promotion based on the "optimum number of selections"¹³ contained in the "Selection Board Instructions." In most cases the number of fully qualified officers will exceed this optimum number. The board considers officers whose relative position on the standing list are greater than the optimum number to have fallen below the "best qualified line."¹⁴ Officers who fall

below this line but who were identified as fully qualified during phase two are considered to be in the "gray zone."¹⁵ These officers will not be selected for promotion unless they are in a critical skill for which the board has not met the selection requirement or the board obtains an increase in the optimum number specified by the Secretary of the Army.

The board reviews the standing list to determine if a sufficient number of officers were identified as best qualified to meet critical skill selection requirements. If not, the board displaces officers above the best qualified line who do not fill a critical skill requirement with officers in the gray zone that do. This process is done in reverse standing list order.¹⁶ The top officer in the gray zone meeting a selection requirement replaces the lowest officer on the tentative selection list that does not meet a critical selection requirement. This process continues until all selection list requirements have been met or until there are no more officers in or above the promotion zone in that particular critical skill.

The final step during the fourth phase is a formal vote by the entire board "to ensure that no officer is recommended as best qualified for promotion unless he or she receives the recommendation of the majority of the board."¹⁷

During the fifth and last phase of the board process, the board identifies officers who should be required to show cause for retention on active duty. The board reconsiders the files of the officers identified for

possible separation during the first two phases of the board process. "Criteria that may warrant a recommendation to show cause include substandard performance of duty, misconduct, moral or professional dereliction"18

Manner of Performance

Within the framework of the selection board process and the best qualified selection criterion discussed earlier, manner of performance is perhaps the most subjective factor in selecting officers for promotion. Consider the example in the following paragraphs as the board evaluates a typical armor officer's file.

When the board evaluates the officer's physical fitness and military bearing, he either met the weight standards and passed the Army Physical Fitness Test or he did not. His uniform fit properly and had the appropriate ribbons and insignia or it did not. His hair was cut within established Army regulations or it was not. Army regulations establish clear standards in this area, leaving little room for interpretation. If the officer has met these standards, he has met the fully qualified selection criterion.

Now consider military and civilian educational qualifications. DA PAM 600-3 and the Army education system establish mandatory and optional military and civilian education requirements that officers must meet in order to be promoted to the next higher grade. Assume that armor officers have met these requirements up through the grade of

major. Although there are no mandatory Army educational requirements stated for armor majors in DA PAM 600-3, the study's results for FYs 1990-1992 will show that the selection boards have established a military education level 4 (MEL 4) education as a requirement for promotion to lieutenant colonel. Therefore, officers failing to meet this requirement will not be considered fully qualified for promotion unless the board feels that there are other compelling reasons to consider them fully qualified for promotion to the next higher grade.

To evaluate an armor officer's assignment history and professional development qualifications, the board uses DA PAM 600-3 and the armor representative's pre-board briefing to determine if he meets the fully qualified selection criterion. DA PAM 600-3 states that armor majors, "Must serve as [a] battalion/squadron XO or battalion/squadron, brigade/regimental S3," in order to be considered fully qualified for promotion.¹⁹ Unless the board chooses to completely ignore this requirement, most officers will have to serve as an operations/executive officer (S3/XO) in order to be identified as fully qualified during the first phase of board deliberations.

The final criterion an officer must pass in order to be considered fully qualified for promotion is manner of performance. Promotion board feedback indicates that "Board members understand the center of mass concept and use it when voting a file."²⁰ Based on the center of mass concept,

it is reasonable to believe that a center of mass OER meets the minimum standard under the manner of performance. The extent that manner of performance overcomes deficiencies in the other areas will determine the number of points he receives during the first phase, which in turn influences the officer's position on the relative standing list.

Officers with a substandard manner of performance will not be identified as fully qualified during phase one of the deliberation process regardless of other qualifications. A prime example is an officer who met the physical fitness and military bearing standard, has credit for a MEL 4 education, and has served as an S3/XO and yet failed to be selected for promotion. "Boards placed special emphasis on those reports received for command and S3/XO positions."²¹

Conversely, a select few officers may have such an exceptional manner of performance that the board is compelled to select them for promotion regardless of a deficiency in another area. The study will show that this was the case for 16 of the selectees in the study population.

Significance of the Study

The Army's efforts to reduce force structure and personnel strengths in response to budget cuts have created an air of uncertainty within the officer corps. Officers are beginning to rethink what constitutes a "successful"

career. The current consensus is that a successful career is retiring at twenty years at the rank of lieutenant colonel. Given the current uncertainty on how the Army's drawdown plans will affect them, combined with the threat of reduction in force and selective early retirement boards, officers face many critical career choices in order to meet the best qualified selection criterion.

The significance of the study is that it will rank in order of importance the discriminators used to select armor majors for promotion during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards. These rank-ordered discriminators will form the basis for a series of predictors associated with selection and nonselection to lieutenant colonel during future promotion selection boards. Known studies over the same period have been limited in scope to descriptive statistics. These studies have provided a profile (average age, time in grade, time in service, etc.) of the officers selected in the above and below the zone categories as well as those officers selected or not selected in the primary zone. No attempt was made to rank in order of importance the profile categories with selection or nonselection to lieutenant colonel.

The study results will be used to assess compliance with the policy in force during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards. This information will be provided to the Center for Army Leadership and the Armor Personnel Proponent to determine if the professional

development policy contained in the 1992 version of DA PAM 600-3 needs to be changed. This information will also be available for armor majors so that they may make informed decisions on the education and assignment requirements they should meet in order to be competitive for promotion.

The Primary Research Question

Did the Fiscal Years 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Board results comply with established Army policy?

Secondary Questions

What are the minimum standards for armor majors to be promoted to lieutenant colonel contained in established policy? What common education and assignment variables can be determined from the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Board results? Does a correlation exist between the education and assignment variables and selection or nonselection for promotion to lieutenant colonel? Do current policy requirements or apparent promotion board standards place armor officers at an undue disadvantage for promotion?

Tertiary Questions

What were the common education and assignment patterns of the armor majors selected for promotion during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection

Boards? Did the armor majors selected for promotion during these promotion boards meet the minimum education and assignment standards contained in established policy? What were the common education and assignment patterns of the armor majors not selected for promotion during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards? Did the armor majors not selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel during these promotion boards fail to meet the minimum education and assignment requirements contained in established policy? What was the opportunity for armor majors to meet these minimum education and assignment requirements during FYs 1990-1992? What is the expected opportunity to meet these requirements in the future?

The Hypotheses

The first underlying hypothesis is that there will be a common pattern of discriminators for armor majors selected for promotion during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards.

The second underlying hypothesis is that the armor majors not selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel will show a common pattern of discriminators that was different from the select group.

The null hypothesis is that no common pattern of discriminators between the select and nonselect groups will be found within the limitations of the study.

Assumptions

That a common pattern of discriminators can be found for the armor majors selected and not selected for promotion during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards. That school and promotion selection boards will continue to use the best qualified selection method.²² That officers in the select group will have a higher overall manner of performance as measured on their OERs than the nonselect group. That all armor majors have been branch qualified as captains. The branch qualification standard for captains was, and currently is defined as completion of an officer advanced course and company or troop command for a minimum of twelve months. That the Army will continue its drawdown plans to an end strength of 535,000 soldiers. That armor's relative percentage of authorizations in branch, branch immaterial, functional area positions, and in the transient, holding and school account will continue to approximate historical rates.

Limitations

This study will not consider OER data. A request was sent to Armor Branch, PERSCOM, requesting that they provide OER data on a random sample of the study population. The request was denied because "such information is considered sensitive and could not be released outside PERSCOM."²³

The study recognizes that manner of performance is an important factor in promotion and school selection. However, an objective manner of performance standard is not explicitly specified in Army or Armor Proponent policy, nor is it included as a separate branch qualification requirement in DA PAM 600-3. It is generally accepted that an officer must serve successfully in a branch qualifying assignment in order to receive credit for that assignment. Conversely, officers who do not serve successfully in any assignment are at risk for promotion, and perhaps separation from the Army.

Officer record brief (ORB) data on officers who have separated service will not be available for analysis. Once an officer leaves the Army, his officer ORB is no longer maintained for him at PERSCOM. However, ORB data is available for the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards. The Armor Proponent has previously conducted analyses of selection board results and has maintained ORBs on file with the results.

Opportunity rates for operational assignments will be determined only for those positions coded armor in the first two characters in the authorization documents. Positions coded other than armor usually do not directly contribute to branch-specific skills that are critical to armor officer development. In addition, positions coded other than armor may be legitimately filled by officers from another branch based on availability, therefore there is no

way to determine accurately how many armor officers will be filling those assignments at any given time.

Delimitations

The study will only analyze armor majors in the predominate year group considered in the primary zone for the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards. The study will not analyze lieutenant colonel command board results.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Very little information exists that directly answers the primary research question other than the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM) statistical analyses that are attached as an enclosure to each selection list. The Armor Proponency Office, Fort Knox, Kentucky conducts a more detailed statistical analysis based on data contained on the Officer Record Brief (ORB). No attempt is made by PERSCOM or the Armor Proponent to establish a rank-order correlation between the criteria in their analyses and selection or nonselection for promotion.

The remaining available information begins to answer the secondary and tertiary research questions. This information falls into the following categories: Congressional and Department of Defense (DOD), Army, and armor branch policy; other government data sources and working papers; unpublished papers, and professional journal articles.

Armor Lieutenant Colonel Selection List Analyses

PERSCOM completes a brief statistical summary of all officers selected for promotion in the above the zone (AZ), primary zone (PZ), and below the zone (BZ) selection categories following each promotion selection board. The Armor Proponency Office conducts a more detailed selection list analysis that focuses on armor officers selected and not selected (NS) in the primary zone following promotion and school selection boards. This section summarizes those results.

PERSCOM Analysis

The PERSCOM analysis considers all officers who were eligible during the zone of consideration for that particular board. The statistics are based on information furnished by the Department of the Army (DA) Secretariat for Selection Boards and information contained in the DA Officer Master File.¹ Tables 1-3 show the Army-wide FYs 1990-1992 lieutenant colonel selectee average active federal commissioned service (AFCS), age, and time-in-grade (TIG) at the time of selection.

TABLE 1
LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTEE AVERAGE
ACTIVE FEDERAL COMMISSIONED
SERVICE²

FY	AZ	PZ	BZ
1990	17.4	16.2	15.0
1991	17.2	16.2	15.0
1992	15.6 [<u>sic</u>]	16.2	14.7

TABLE 2
LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTEE
AVERAGE AGE³
(Years and Months)

FY	AZ	PZ	BZ
1990	40.5	39.1	37.6
1991	41.0	39.2	38.1
1992	40.2	39.1	37.2

TABLE 3
LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTEE
AVERAGE TIME-IN-GRADE⁴

FY	AZ	PZ	BZ
1990	6.2	4.9	3.9
1991	6.1	5.0	3.8
1992	6.1	4.8	3.1

The final category in the PERSCOM selectee profile focuses on the military education level 4 (MEL 4) completion rate for the selectees only. This begins to answer the secondary and tertiary questions of the study concerning common education variables. Table 4 shows that all but .5% of the FY 1992 primary zone selectees had received credit for a MEL 4 education through either the resident or nonresident option. This begins to establish a connection between a MEL 4 education and promotion selection.

TABLE 4
LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTEE
MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL 4
COMPLETION RATE⁵

	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92
Above the zone	100%	100%	100%
Primary zone	100%	100%	99.5%
Below the zone	100%	100%	100%

Armor Proponent Analyses⁶

The Armor Proponent analysis focuses exclusively on the armor officers who were considered during a particular promotion or school selection board. They compile a statistical analysis of the predominate year group officers selected and not selected in the primary zone from the current board. The armor officers from the same year group who were selected for promotion in the below the zone

selection category during last year's board are also included in their analysis. The statistics are based on manually extracted ORB data. The results are used to assess compliance with Armor Proponent policy and are reported to the Armor School Commandant and Armor Branch, PERSCOM for their use as appropriate.

Tables 5-10 compare the armor officers selected in the primary zone (PZ) with the officers not selected (NS) during the FYs 1989-1991 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards in the following categories: military and college education levels; combat experience; elapsed time in years and months since last troop assignment; number and type of company or troop command; and service as an operations/executive officer (S3/XO). The results show that there are common variables in the select and nonselect groups and that a relationship exists between these variables and selection or nonselection for promotion, which begins to refute the null hypothesis.

Table 5 confirms the PERSCOM analysis and compares the percentage of armor officers who have completed the Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC), the School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), or other command and staff college-level (CSC) schooling to those who have not in the select and nonselect groups.

TABLE 5

**ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTS VERSUS NONSELECTS,
MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL 4 COMPLETION SOURCE¹
(Predominate Year Group Only)**

	FY 89		FY 90		FY 91	
	PZ	NS	PZ	NS	PZ	NS
Resident CGSOC	71%	11%	46%	9%	46%	8%
SAMS	11%	0%	3%	0%	8%	0%
Nonresident CGSOC	18%	71%	36%	67%	28%	61%
Other CSC	- -	- -	15%	7%	18%	0%
None	0%	18%	0%	17%	0%	31%

Approximately 46-50% of any given year group are selected for resident CSC-level schooling.⁸ SAMS administers the Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP) following an officer's graduation from resident CGSOC. Approximately fifty students from all services are selected to attend the AMSP. Most Army officers selected for resident CSC-level schooling attend the CGSOC at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. However, some officers will attend the Navy, Marine, or Air Force Command and Staff Colleges, the U.S. Army School of the Americas or a foreign school that conducts an equivalent program. The results show that there is a connection between military education and selection or nonselection to lieutenant colonel.

Table 6 shows the percentage of armor officers with advanced civilian degrees.

TABLE 6

**ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTS VERSUS NONSELECTS,
HIGHEST CIVILIAN DEGREE EARNED⁹
(Predominate Year Group Only)**

	FY 89		FY 90		FY 91	
	PZ	NS	PZ	NS	PZ	NS
Bachelors	21%	53%	19%	65%	30%	50%
Masters	78%	48%	74%	28%	58%	42%
Two Masters	- -	- -	4%	7%	28%	12%
Doctorate	1%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%

Concern exists within the officer corps that those officers who have not participated in combat are at a disadvantage for promotion and schooling when compared with the officers who have gained combat experience. The Honorable Michael P.W. Stone, Secretary of the Army, has taken steps to reduce the potential bias that might exist in the board members' mind by issuing the following instruction to the FY 1991 and 1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards, "We will not penalize officers who did not get the opportunity to participate in combat."¹⁰

Table 7 shows the percentage of armor officers who have combat experience as either an officer or enlisted soldier. No armor majors were identified as participating in Operations Urgent Fury or Just Cause.

TABLE 7

ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTS VERSUS NONSELECTS,
COMBAT EXPERIENCE¹¹
(Predominate Year Group Only)

	FY 89		FY 90		FY 91	
	PZ	NS	PZ	NS	PZ	NS
Desert Storm	- -	- -	- -	- -	39%	23%
Vietnam	- -	- -	5%	2%	2%	4%

Table 8 shows the relationship between elapsed time in years and months since the last troop assignment and selection and nonselection for lieutenant colonel. A troop assignment was defined as any assignment at division-level and below.

TABLE 8

ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECT VERSUS NONSELECTS,
TIME SINCE LAST TROOP ASSIGNMENT¹²
(Predominate Year Group Only)

	FY 89		FY 90		FY 91	
	PZ	NS	PZ	NS	PZ	NS
0 to 1.0 year	57%	32%	63%	25%	69%	54%
1.1 to 2.0 years	18%	9%	12%	2%	11%	18%
2.1 to 3.0 years	8%	11%	10%	12%	7%	4%
3.1 to 4.0 years	6%	11%	3%	0%	5%	4%
4.1 to 5.0 years	2%	7%	2%	5%	0%	8%
5.0 years or more	9%	30%	10%	56%	8%	12%

There is general consensus among branch proponents that completing an officer advanced course and company command branch qualify an officer for the remainder of his or her career. The officer's manner of performance during company or troop command influence promotion selection to major, and resident CSC schooling. Table 9 shows that all officers completed at least one command and compares the type and number of commands completed. Two types of commands exist: (1) modified table of organization and equipment (MTOE) units, these are organizations with an assigned wartime mission, for example tank battalions and cavalry squadrons; (2) table of distribution and allowance (TDA) organizations, these units do not have a wartime mission as such, and are located in training and installation housekeeping organizations.

TABLE 9

**ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTS VERSUS NONSELECTS,
COMPANY/TROOP COMMAND EXPERIENCE¹³
(Predominate Year Group Only)**

	FY 89		FY 90		FY 91	
	PZ	NS	PZ	NS	PZ	NS
First Command						
MTOE	88%	77%	90%	79%	89%	85%
TDA	12%	23%	10%	21%	11%	15%
Second Command						
MTOE	30%	36%	26%	33%	25%	19%
TDA	0%	5%	3%	7%	0%	4%
Third Command						
MTOE	0%	9%	0%	5%	4%	0%
TDA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

It is a common belief that service as a battalion operations/executive officer (S3/XO), or brigade S3 is a prerequisite for battalion command. Table 10 shows the percentages of officers who served in each one of those positions in either a MTOE unit or a TDA unit, each time they served in those jobs as a major. For example, if an officer served as a battalion S3 and later as the XO, he is counted in both categories. A select few captains, because of their demonstrated ability, serve as a battalion S3, or in even fewer cases as a brigade S3. Officers in this category are not considered to be branch qualified under the policy in the 1989 version of DA PAM 600-3. Most officers in this category who were selected for promotion served in

one of those positions again as a major. The key statistic is the percentage of officers who have not served in any of these positions at all. There have been a few officers who have been promoted without serving as an S3/XO, however they appear to be the exception.

TABLE 10

ARMOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL SELECTS VERSUS NONSELECTS,
OPERATIONS/EXECUTIVE OFFICER EXPERIENCE¹⁴
(Predominate Year Group Only)

	FY 89		FY 90		FY 91	
	PZ	NS	PZ	NS	PZ	NS
Battalion S3	63%	36%	49%	23%	51%	19%
Battalion XO	50%	34%	52%	14%	45%	42%
Battalion S3 and XO	16%	13%	16%	12%	11%	0%
Brigade S3	21%	0%	5%	2%	10%	4%
Battalion XO and Brigade S3	- -	- -	5%	0%	5%	4%
Captain S3	16%	11%	14%	16%	20%	4%
No S3 or XO Time	0%	41%	3%	44%	10%	10%

Analysis Section Summary

This section has briefly shown that common education and assignment patterns do exist within each group. The three major discriminators appear to be MEL 4 completion, S3/XO experience, and time away from troops. All selectees completed CSC-level schooling while up to 31% of the nonselectees did not. With the exception of the FY 1991

results, over 40% of the nonselectees had not served as an S3/XO while 10% or fewer of the selectees had failed to serve in one of these jobs. Over a three-year average, 77% of the selectees had served with troops within two years of the board convening date, compared with 47% of the nonselects. These differences refute the null hypothesis, but do not establish a relative strength of association between these factors and selection or nonselection for promotion.

Established Policy

This section briefly outlines Congressional and Department of Defense, Army, and the Armor Proponent policy in force during the FYs 1990-1992 selection boards as well as changes to the policy resulting from the Department of the Army Pamphlet (DA PAM) 600-3, Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Utilization revision process.

Congressional and Department of Defense Policy

Title 10, United States Code establishes DOD policy and provides the details of the officer promotion system defined in the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA). Title 10, United States Code provides the rules and laws that the Army must abide by in promoting commissioned officers. Table 11 shows the promotion timing objectives and cumulative promotion opportunity percentages established by DOPMA.

TABLE 11
PROMOTION TIMING AND OPPORTUNITY OBJECTIVES¹⁵

	Pin-on Point	Oppor- tunity
Major	10 years \pm 1 year	80%
Lieutenant colonel	16 years \pm 1 year	70%
Colonel	22 years \pm 1 year	50%

Department of the Army Policy

Title 10 United States Code directs that, "The Service Secretary concerned shall provide written instructions to promotion selection boards" ¹⁶
In his "Selection Board Instructions" to the promotion selection boards, the Secretary of the Army has stated that, "Today's Army assignment policy is that all assignments are important assignments," ¹⁷ In addressing the selection criterion the board is to use, he goes on to say that:

The principal criterion for selection must be the potential of the officer for outstanding service in the next higher grade. Some of the indicators of potential by which the board will determine whether to recommend an individual officer for promotion are: physical fitness and military bearing, military and civilian education, assignment history and professional development, performance, and professional attributes. ¹⁸

To help the board assess an officer's professional development, the board is instructed to use DA PAM 600-3 as "a general guide that the board may use to help it evaluate

career field and skill qualifications."¹⁹ Branch and functional area proponents establish the professional development and skill qualifications for their particular career field. They share responsibility with the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER) for the content in DA PAM 600-3 by articulating their unique branch and functional area skill qualification requirements.

Armor Proponent Policy

The "Armor Chapter" in DA PAM 600-3 describes branch qualification standards for the ranks lieutenant through colonel. This chapter states that armor majors:

- Must serve as [a] battalion/squadron XO or battalion/squadron, brigade/regimental S3.

- Must serve in various key duty positions; primary staff at battalion/brigade/regiment, instructor, non-troop, functional area or joint assignments.

- Should be selected for attendance to CGSC or its equivalent, or be enrolled in a non-resident CGSC (MEL 4).²⁰

Armor's policy was that a major must serve as an S3/XO for a minimum of 18 months plus or minus 6 months in order to meet the branch qualification requirement.²¹ However, as a result of the recent force structure reductions, the Armor Proponent reduced the time requirement to a minimum of 12 months.²² This was done in order to increase the opportunity for armor majors to serve in one of these critical jobs.

More recently, the Army began to revise DA PAM 600-3. The DCSPER, through the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) tasked the Combined Arms Center, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas to be the action agency for the revision process. During the revision process, Armor's policy regarding field grade branch qualification standards were seen as the most restrictive by the Combined Arms Center and the other proponents. In order to achieve a degree of uniformity among proponents, the Combined Arms Center directed that branch qualification apply only up through the rank of captain.²³ Field grades would be required to meet "branch standards" in lieu of branch qualifying at each rank, major through colonel.²⁴

The revised version of the "Armor Chapter" in "DA PAM 600-3, Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Utilization (Final Draft)" offers the following definition of branch standards:

Officers must meet certain standards in terms of schooling and operational assignments to be fully qualified in Armor Branch at each grade. Meeting these standards ensures that the officer has acquired the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to remain proficient in the Armor Branch at that grade, and is fully qualified for promotion/retention in the branch.²⁵

The branch standards for armor majors were revised to make the following changes: (1) requiring MEL 4 completion, (2) adding other positions in addition to S3/XO jobs in order to increase the opportunity to serve in a

qualifying job, such as combat training center battalion and brigade S3 and XO trainer positions, (3) giving credit for promotable captains serving in major branch standard positions, and (4) establishing the two-tiered qualification system of "fully" and "exceptionally qualified." Fully qualified is intended to make an officer eligible for promotion to the next rank. Exceptionally qualified is intended to make an officer competitive for command at the next rank.²⁶

Other Government Data Sources and Working Papers

The ORB is a part of the officer's personnel file that is provided to selection boards to assist them in selecting officers for promotion, schools, or elimination. The ORBs contain each individual officer's assignment history, military and civilian educational institutions attended, and other items of information about the officer. ORBs do not contain manner of performance information.

In addition to the Secretary of the Army's "Selection Board Instructions" and the PERSCOM analyses discussed earlier, the FYs 1990-1992 lieutenant colonel promotion lists contained the following additional information: (1) minimum branch and functional area selection requirements, (2) a list of officers considered above the zone and in the primary zone of consideration. Three PERSCOM summaries not discussed earlier are: (1) the branch and the Army selection rates that year,

(2) functional area selection rates, and (3) joint service officer selection rates.

Unpublished Papers

During the revision of DA PAM 600-3, much discussion ensued between the DCSPER, the School Commandants and the Combined Arms Center over the issue of branch qualification for majors. Since Armor's policy was seen as the most restrictive, the Armor Center distributed a paper to selected senior Army leaders entitled, "Branch Qualification of Armor Majors," to gain support for their position and to state the rationale for their policy. Their position was that the requirement for armor majors to serve as an S3/XO honestly communicates the standard selection boards expect of armor majors, that the requirement meets the needs of the Army, and that the requirement is fair to the officers involved.²⁷

Professional Journal Articles

During the initial stages of the DA PAM 600-3 revision process, Infantry magazine stated a more restrictive branch qualification standard than armor. Armor policy did not differentiate between MTOE and TDA units for service as an S3/XO. Although infantry branch did not exclude TDA units, they prioritized the type of units that their majors should serve in to become branch qualified. Infantry magazine stated that infantry majors needed to

serve as a MTOE S3/XO in order to be branch qualified.²⁸

They went on to say:

Our advice to all Infantry majors is that if it appears that you will not be assigned as an S-3 or XO in a TOE [sic] infantry battalion or brigade, you should actively seek the same position in other units. Interview for positions in other types of battalions--support, special, TDA, or recruiting. You will increase your chances for promotion by doing so.²⁹

However, they later reversed their position to state that branch qualification does not occur past the rank of captain.³⁰

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The study will use a combination of descriptive and predictive analysis to determine if a correlation exists between selected education and assignment variables and selection or nonselection to lieutenant colonel.

Methodology Overview

The Fiscal Year (FY) 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection board results will be examined to determine if a "strength of association"¹ exists between the education and assignment variables considered in this study and selection and nonselection to lieutenant colonel. The results will be compared with the policies in force during that same period to determine the level of compliance. Finally, the study will predict the education and assignment opportunities if the trends continue in the future.

Board History

The FYs 1990-1992 promotion lists will be analyzed to determine the select and nonselect groups. The nonselect group is determined by comparing the list of the officers considered for promotion with the list of those selected for

promotion. The differences between the two lists will yield the nonselect group of armor officers.

Population and Sampling

The study population will be all armor majors in the predominate year group considered in the primary zone for promotion during the FYs 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Boards. Officers in the primary zone usually come from more than one year group. The rationale for selecting officers in the predominate year group (PYG) is that they best represent the typical due-course officer who is promoted with his peers. Officers in the year groups senior and junior to the PYG have been passed-over at an earlier rank, or will have had one or more below the zone promotions respectively. Both of these groups represent abnormal circumstances that could potentially skew the data.

To gather information on the variables selected in the study, officer record brief (ORB) data must be obtained. ORBs are readily available on the study population, therefore, the ORB data sample size will be 100 percent of the study population. Table 12 compares the relative size of the PYG with the total number of armor officers selected and not selected in the primary zone.

TABLE 12
STUDY POPULATION SAMPLE SIZE

FY	PYG	Tot. Cons.	Tot. Sel.	PYG Sel.	PYG %	Tot. NS	PYG NS	PYG %
1990	74	115	71	58	82%	44	39	88%
1991	75	106	72	61	85%	34	25	74%
1992	76	183	121	111	92%	62	45	73%

Officer Record Brief Data

The ORB contains ten sections with several pieces of information needed for the study. No attempt will be made to list all the information that is found on an ORB, what follows is a summary to indicate the type and amount of data that is found on this document.

Section I--Assignment Information: number and duration of overseas tours, the officer's branch and functional area (FA), and aviator qualifications.

Section II--Security Data: security clearance information.

Section III--Service Data: the officer's date of rank to each grade, months active federal commissioned service, source and type of initial commission.

Section IV--Personal/Family Data: marital status, date of physical, date of birth, and mailing address.

Section V--Foreign Language: foreign language proficiency, if any.

Section VI--Military Education: military education level and other formal military completed with year attended.

Section VII--Civilian Education: civilian education level, institutions attended, degrees conferred and dates awarded.

Section VIII--Awards and Decorations: all awards earned as an officer or enlisted soldier, special skill badges (ranger, airborne).

Section IX--Assignment History: assignment dates, months duration, organization, location, duty title, and duty position coding information.

Section X--Remarks: combat training center experience, joint duty status, date of last photo, assignment preference, and regimental affiliation.

Sanitation Procedures

Officer record briefs will be sanitized by marking out all of the officer's personal and family data except date of birth and race. The name and social security number will be blacked out as well once the ORBs are cross-referenced and sorted by promotion list and selection category. Each ORB will then receive a record number containing the board year, selection category, and sequence number. For example, 92S-1 means officer number one in the selectee category during the FY 1992 board.

Officer Record Brief Analysis Categories

The following paragraphs specify the data fields considered in this analysis, section found on the ORB, and possible responses.

Source of Commission

Section III--Service Data. Possible responses are:

(1) United States Military Academy (USMA), (2) Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), (3) ROTC Distinguished Military Graduate (DMG), (4) Officer Candidate School (OCS), and (5) Other commissioning sources, for example, direct commissions and Army National Guard OCS.

Military Education Level 4 Education Source

Section VI--Military Education. Possible responses

are: (1) None, (2) Resident Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC), (3) Nonresident CGSOC (4) Both Resident and Nonresident CGSOC, (5) School of Advanced Military Studies, and (6) Other Command and Staff Colleges (Air Force, Navy, Marine, and selected foreign programs).

Highest Civilian Degree Earned

Section VII--Civilian Education. Possible responses

are: (1) Bachelors, (2) Masters, (3) two Masters, and (4) Doctorate. Associate degrees were not considered because it is a requirement that all officers earn a Bachelors degree prior to their eighth year of active federal commissioned service.

Current Functional Area

Section I--Assignment Information. Possible responses are: (1) FA 39--psychological operations/civil affairs, (2) FA 41--personnel programs management, (3) FA 45--comptroller, (4) FA 46--public affairs, (5) FA 48--foreign area officer, (6) FA 49--operations research/systems analyst, (7) FA 50--force development, (8) FA 51--research and development, (9) FA 52--nuclear weapons, (10) FA 53--systems automation, (11) FA 54--plans, operations, and training, (12) FA 97--contracting and industrial management, and (13) additional specialties as encountered.

Armor's inventory is centered around FA 41 (13%), FA 51 (16%), and FA 54 (34%).² Certain functional areas such as FA 49 require extensive training and repetitive assignments in that functional area in order to remain qualified in that functional area. Statistical analysis has the potential to show that certain functional areas are not conducive to remaining competitive for promotion as an armor officer.

FA 97 was integrated into the Army Acquisition Corps in 1991. FA 51 is scheduled to integrate into the Army Acquisition Corps in 1992. Eligible armor officers holding these functional areas have been accessed into the Army Acquisition Corps and will no longer compete for promotion as an armor officer. However, for the purposes of this study, officers holding FA 97 in 1990 will be considered as

holding this functional area as their "current" designated functional area.

Certain officers have been allowed to maintain a second basic branch or additional specialty (ie., aviation). This is not the norm for combat arms officers. However, upon the implementation of the Officer Personnel Management System II (OPMS-II) in 1984, these officers were allowed to maintain their additional specialty.³

Number of Functional Area Assignments

Section IX--Assignment History. Possible responses are the number of different functional area assignments coded with the officer's designated functional area in either the first or last two characters in the duty military occupational specialty column on his officer record brief. For example, an officer filling either a 12A41 (an armor officer with a FA 41 background) or 41A00 (FA 41 officer of any branch) position would be considered as serving in a functional area assignment if his current designated functional area is FA 41. However, if his current functional area is FA 49, those assignments would not be considered as serving in a functional area assignment. The rationale is that service outside an officer's designated functional area does not build the appropriate skills, knowledge, and attitudes to make that officer more competitive for promotion in his functional area.

The normal career track is to dual-track in both a branch and a functional area. Army policy precludes armor officers from single-tracking in armor.⁴ Officers who remain qualified in both their basic branch and functional area may be more competitive for promotion. Conversely, those officers who spend an extended time away from armor may no longer be seen as competitive for promotion in armor.

Combat Experience

Sections I, VIII, and IX--Assignment Information, Awards and Decorations, and Assignment History. Possible responses are yes or no.

Combat experience is not listed on the ORB, however one can determine whether an officer served in combat with a good degree of certainty. Officers who served in Vietnam will have the location listed in the Assignment History section of his officer record brief. Vietnam will also be listed as an overseas tour. Combat awards in the Awards and Decorations section are also a reliable indicator of combat participation. During Desert Storm, many ORBs had a Southwest Asia location listed in the Station column of the Assignment History section. Personnel managers also placed "deployment returnee" in the Remarks section.

Number of Company/Troop Commands

Section IX--Assignment History. Possible responses are: one, two, or three.

Type of Company/Troop Command

Section IX--Assignment History. Possible responses are: (1) modified table of organization and equipment (MTOE) headquarters company/troop, (2) MTOE maneuver company, (3) table of distribution and allowance (TDA) headquarters company/troop, and (4) TDA lettered company/troop. Analysis will show whether there is a bias against officers who commanded a TDA company/troop commander as their only command.

Total Months in Company/Troop Command

Section IX--Assignment History. Response will be the total number of months served in all commands regardless of type of organization.

Average Company/Troop Command Tour Length

Possible responses: (1) mean, (2) median, and (3) mode. Armor policy states that officers must command a company or troop for a minimum of twelve months. The responses will be used to determine compliance with that policy. The results will also establish an actual tour length source in order to estimate future opportunity rates.

Operations/Executive Officer Experience

Section IX--Assignment History. Possible responses are: (1) none, (2) battalion/squadron operations officer (S3), (3) battalion/squadron executive officer (XO), and (4) brigade/regimental S3. Within each assignment category,

there are the following sub-categories: rank served, TOE or TDA unit, time served in each position, and whether or not they are currently serving in one of those jobs. Officers serving in other than armor or infantry organizations will not be credited as serving in one of these jobs. For example, time served as a forward support battalion S3 does not count as viable S3 time for an armor officer.

The analysis will track the different possible combinations of jobs for the officers who had repetitive tours as an S3/XO. The study will also attempt to determine if a TDA bias exists here as well.

Total Months Served as an Operations/Executive Officer

Section IX--Assignment History. Response is the number of months served as an S3/XO as a major. The results will test compliance with the 18 plus or minus 6 months policy in the 1989 version of DA PAM 600-3. Officers serving in an S3/XO job at the time of the board convene date will be included. Captains serving in an S3 position who were not promoted to major during their tour of duty will be excluded. The policy in force during the FYs 1990-1992 lieutenant colonel promotion selection boards stated that armor officers must serve as an S3/XO as a major in order to receive credit for the assignment.

Months per Completed Operations/Executive Officer Assignment

Possible responses: (1) mean, (2) median, and (3) mode. Officers serving in an S3/XO job at the time of the

board convene date will have that assignment only excluded. The study will consider previously completed assignments as part of the average. The results will establish a second tour length source to estimate future opportunities to serve in these positions.

Most Recent Troop Experience

Section IX--Assignment History. For the purpose of this study service with troops is any assignment at division-level and below. It does not include installation staff jobs on a one-division post. Time is computed up to the board convene date and is rounded to the nearest month. Years and months are expressed as decimals (5 years, 2 months is expressed as 5.2 years). Possible responses are: 0.0 to 1.0 years, 1.1 to 2.0 years, 2.1 to 3.0 years, 3.1 to 4.0 years, 4.1 to 5.0 years, 5.1 to 6.0 years, 6.1 to 7.0 years, 7.1 to 8.0 years, 8.1 to 9.0 years, 9.1 to 10.0 years, and 10.0 years or more.

Joint Duty Experience

Section X--Remarks. Possible responses are: (1) currently serving, or (2) completed assignment with or without a waiver. Officers who have completed one joint assignment and are currently serving in a second joint assignment will be counted in both categories.

Other Key Jobs

Section IX--Assignment History. Possible responses will be the number of assignments, total months served, and average number of months per assignment in the following job categories: (1) brigade/regimental staff, (2) division staff, (3) corps staff, (4) Pentagon staff, (5) PERSCOM staff, (6) TRADOC school instructor, (7) combat training center observer/controller, (8) USMA faculty or staff, (9) ROTC, (10) Recruiting Command, and (11) Reserve Component support. The resulting data should begin to test the Army's stated assignment philosophy that "all assignments are important assignments."⁵

Board Results Analysis

Officer record brief data will be extracted, tabulated and initially entered into a database using the categories discussed earlier. The database files will then be analyzed using the software program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), to determine the strength of association between selected education and assignment variables and selection and nonselection for promotion. Initial statistical test will be the Chi-square test of independence to determine if selection or nonselection for promotion is dependent on any of the ORB categories analyzed. The ORB data files used for this study will be filed with the Armor Proponency Office, Fort Knox, Kentucky for future comparison studies.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter report the officer record brief (ORB) category analysis results; use these results to test the hypotheses and compliance with Army policy; and estimate future educational and assignment opportunities for armor majors.

Officer Record Brief Analysis Results

The ORB analysis produced several predictors associated with selection and nonselection of armor majors for promotion to lieutenant colonel. The decision criterion to consider the independent (ORB) variable a predictor was at the .05 level of significance ($P \leq .05$) utilizing the Chi-square test of independence with Yates' correction.¹ This means that selection or nonselection for promotion is dependent on the ORB category under analysis. The following tables will show the ORB categories that met the .05 level of significance threshold. The tables will compare the observed and expected values in percents with the overall study population (SP) select and nonselect group percents to show the degree of difference from overall study

population. The records from all three board years were combined in order to minimize inherent board differences.

Source of Commission

The Officer Candidate School (OCS) and Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) Distinguished Military Graduate (DMG) commissioning categories did not meet the .05 level of significance. However, the United States Military Academy (USMA) and the ROTC non-DMG categories did prove to be statistically significant predictors.

Graduating from the USMA is a positive factor for selection to lieutenant colonel. Table 13 shows that USMA graduates were selected at a 15.9% greater rate than the overall SP select group rate. Nonselectees who graduated from all other commissioning sources experienced a 5.3% increase over the expected value for nonselectees.

TABLE 13
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY GRADUATES
(P < .005)

	Non-USMA	USMA	SP
Nonselects	95 (37.5%)	14 (16.3%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	158 (62.5%)	72 (83.7%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	253 (74.6%)	86 (25.4%)	339 (100%)

The disparity can be explained in part by the number and perceived quality of cadets produced by each program. USMA graduates approximately 1,000 cadets per year, compared with at least 5,000 or more cadets through the ROTC program. Admission to the USMA is highly competitive. Entry into a ROTC program depends on that particular college's entry requirements, which may or may not be as competitive as the USMA. All USMA graduates receive Regular Army commissions and serve on active duty. Approximately 35% of ROTC cadets can expect to receive a Regular Army commission. The number of ROTC and OCS cadets who are allowed to serve on active duty is based on the remaining Army requirements after the USMA contribution.

The overall percentage of USMA graduates (25.4%) compared to other commissioning sources approximates armor's historical source of commission percentages. Until recently, approximately 27% of armor's accessions came from the USMA, 67% from the ROTC, and 6% from the Officer Candidate School.²

Table 14 shows that it may be disadvantage to be commissioned through the ROTC program and not be a Distinguished Military Graduate (non-DMG). USMA, ROTC-DMG, and OCS graduates were placed in an "All Others" category. ROTC non-DMG graduates experienced an 8.3% increase in nonselection over the expected norm compared to the "All Others" category of officers who were selected for promotion at a rate 7.3% over the expected norm. Since all other

commissioning sources except the USMA did not meet the .05 level of significance, USMA graduates account for a large portion of the increase in promotion selection from the "All Others" category.

TABLE 14
RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS
NON-DISTINGUISHED MILITARY
GRADUATES VERSUS ALL OTHER
COMMISSIONING SOURCES
(P < .025)

	All Others	ROTC Non-DMG	SP
Nonselects	45 (24.9%)	64 (40.5%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	136 (75.1%)	94 (59.5%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	181 (53.4%)	158 (46.6%)	339 (100%)

Military Education Level 4 Education Source

Most officers obtain a military education level 4 education by attending a resident command and staff college (CSC) program or by completing the Nonresident Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC) through either the correspondence or Reserve Forces School options. Approximately 50% of any given year group are selected over a four-year period to attend a resident MEL 4 program.

Officers who are not selected in their second year of eligibility are encouraged to enroll in the Nonresident CGSOC program.³

Not completing a MEL 4 program virtually assures nonselection to lieutenant colonel. Table 15 shows that 46.5% more of the nonselectees failed to complete a MEL 4 program than the expected norm. Officers not completing a MEL 4 program were almost four times as likely to be nonselected rather than selected for promotion. The seven officers who were selected and had not completed a MEL 4 program were selected during the FY 1992 selection board. Of those seven, six were currently enrolled in a resident program when the promotion board met.

TABLE 15
MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL 4
PROGRAM COMPLETION
(P < .005)

	Yes	No	SP
Nonselects	83 (27.1%)	26 (78.7%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	223 (72.9%)	7 (21.3%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	306 (90.3%)	33 (9.7%)	339 (100%)

Completing the Nonresident CGSOC was found to have a negative influence on promotion selection, unless the officer later completed a resident program. Table 16 shows that the nonselect group completed Nonresident CGSOC at a 10.1% greater rate than the SP expected value, conversely, the select group completed a resident MEL 4 program at a 12.1% greater rate than the expected value. The table excludes the group of officers who have completed a resident program in addition to the Nonresident CGSOC program (38 officers). The group of officers who have not completed MEL 4 program at all (33 officers) were also excluded to isolate the group of officers whose only source of a MEL 4 education was the Nonresident CGSOC program.

TABLE 16
NONRESIDENT VERSUS RESIDENT
MILITARY EDUCATION LEVEL 4
PROGRAM COMPLETION
(P < .005)

	Resident	Nonres.	SP
Nonselects	19 (15.6%)	55 (37.7%)	74 (27.6%)
Selects	103 (84.4%)	91 (62.3%)	194 (72.3%)
Total (% SP)	122 (45.5%)	146 (54.5%)	268 (100%)

The Army's stated goal of selecting only 50% of any given year group for attendance at a resident MEL 4 program requires that the Command and Staff College (CSC) Selection Boards use the "best qualified" method of selection. It is then reasonable to believe the officers selected for resident CSC attendance were perceived to be of higher overall quality than the officers not selected for resident attendance to a MEL 4 program. Therefore, the Nonresident CGSOC itself is not necessarily the predictor. However, it is an indicator to the officer of his current promotion potential. The SP selection rate for all resident MEL 4 programs was 160 officers or 47.2% of the total SP (119 or 35.1% of the total attended the CGSOC).

Attending other resident programs such as the Navy and Air Force programs were not found to be significant. Of the 41 officers (12.1% of the SP) who attended other resident programs, 29 were selected for promotion. Once an officer has been selected for attendance to a resident MEL 4 program, it is less an issue of quality, rather than the process of matching the officer's desires with available school allocations.

Highest Civilian Degree Earned

Although 189 officers (55.8% of the SP) had an advanced degree, graduate degrees were not found to be a significant predictor ($P > .25$) for selection or nonselection to lieutenant colonel. However, 131 selectees

(39% of the SP) and 58 nonselectees (17% of the SP) had a Masters Degree. An additional 23 officers had a second Masters Degree, and 4 more had a Doctorate Degree.

Current Functional Area

Three functional area (FA) designations were found to be statistically significant predictors:

- (1) FA 41--personnel programs management,
- (2) FA 49--operations research/systems analyst, and
- (3) FA 92--quartermaster. Functional areas 41 and 49 appeared to be positive predictors for promotion selection, while functional area 92 was a negative predictor.

Recall that one of the functional areas that armor's inventory is centered around is FA 41. This functional area is popular because it requires little formal training when compared to more technical functional areas such as FA 40. An additional factor that makes this functional area attractive to many armor majors is that there are opportunities to serve in FA 41 positions at division-level and below. This places those officers in an advantageous position to compete for an operations/executive officer (S3/XO) assignment when compared to other functional areas.

The disadvantage to this functional area is that only 25% of the Army's total inventory of FA 41 officers are allowed to single-track in this functional area.⁴ This effectively reduces an armor officer's career options if he

determines that he is no longer competitive for promotion in his branch.

Table 17 shows that officers who held FA 41 were selected at a rate of 13.3% above the SP expected value.

TABLE 17
FUNCTIONAL AREA 41 VERSUS ALL OTHER
FUNCTIONAL AREAS
(P < .05)

	Other	FA 41	SP
Nonselects	99 (34.6%)	10 (18.9%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	187 (65.4%)	43 (81.1%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	286 (83.4%)	53 (15.6%)	339 (100%)

Functional area 49 is one of the Army's most technical functional areas and requires extensive training and experience in order to remain competitive for promotion as an operations research/systems analyst. This functional area requires an advanced degree and a minimum of two assignments in FA 49 in order for the officers to have the option of single-tracking in FA 49.⁵ In order for an armor officer to keep his career options open, he must carefully balance competing branch and functional area requirements to remain competitive for promotion in both his branch and FA 49. Table 18 shows that armor officers who succeed in

balancing these requirements are promoted at a much higher rate than the expected value.

TABLE 18
FUNCTIONAL AREA 49 VERSUS ALL OTHER
FUNCTIONAL AREAS
(P < .025)

	Other	FA 49	SP
Nonselects	108 (33.7%)	1 (5.3%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	212 (66.3%)	18 (94.7%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	320 (94.4%)	19 (5.6%)	339 (100%)

With the advent of the Officer Personnel Management System II, certain armor officers were allowed to maintain a second branch specialty in addition to armor. This additional specialty then became their functional area. This was the case for FA 92. However, implementation of the Officer Personnel Management System II also prevented any future officers from declaring a second basic branch specialty as their functional area. Armor officers who maintained a FA 92 designation were placed at a distinct disadvantage for promotion compared to all other functional areas. Table 19 shows that 23% more of these officers were nonselected for promotion than the SP expected value. The primary reason for this condition was that these officers

spent an extended time away from armor assignments without declaring their intent to single-track in FA 92. Some officers were even serving as forward support battalion and main support battalion XO's. Those assignments do not serve as a viable XO assignment for armor officers.

TABLE 19
FUNCTIONAL AREA 92 VERSUS ALL OTHER
FUNCTIONAL AREAS
(P < .025)

	Other	FA 92	SP
Nonselects	93 (30%)	16 (55.2%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	217 (70%)	13 (44.8%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	310 (91.4%)	29 (8.6%)	339 (100%)

Number of Functional Area Assignments

Although over one-third of the officers had served in at least one functional area assignment, this was not found to be a significant factor ($P > .21$) for or against promotion selection. This means that unless the officer is in a functional area that requires extensive training and experience, there is little advantage to serving in a functional area assignment. In addition, certain functional areas do not allow officers to single-track in that functional area. For example, FA 54--operations, plans and

training.⁶ Therefore, an officer who has a FA 54 designation effectively has only one option open to him--single-track in his branch.

Combat Experience

Combat experience was not found to have a significant ($P > .36$) influence on promotion selection. A total of 77 (22.7%) of the officers in the study population had combat experience. Of the officers who had combat experience 56 (16.5%) were selected for promotion, 21 (6.2%) were not. This reflects the Army's concerted effort to "not penalize officers who did not get the opportunity to participate in combat."⁷

Number and Type of Company/Troop Commands

Company command is the single-most critical assignment for armor captains and is universally accepted as a branch qualifying assignment across the Army. The typical armor captain commands only once, usually following completion of either the Armor Officer Advanced Course or the Infantry Officer Advanced Course.

Although approximately one-third of the study population commanded more than once, the number of commands were not found to have a statistically significant influence on promotion selection.

The type of first company command was found to be a statistically significant factor. The study revealed that there is a bias against officers who commanded a table of

distribution and allowance (TDA) company compared to those who commanded a modified table of organization and equipment (MTOE) company. This bias may be due to the perception that TDA commanders do not build the level of warfighting skills that MTOE commanders do. MTOE commanders participate in external evaluations, gunnery exercises, and combat training center rotations.

On the other hand, many perceive that TDA commanders have the easier of the two types of commands. One reason for this perception is the belief that their duties are administrative in nature and that they do not face the challenges that MTOE commanders do on a daily basis. Many would argue that commanding a training company such as the United States Army Armor Center's (USAARMC) one station unit training companies at Fort Knox, Kentucky have the more critical mission of turning civilians into soldiers.

In an Army Times article entitled "Kiss of Death [--] Training Jobs Kill Combat Commanders' Careers," a senior officer was quoted as saying the following:

There is the issue of high risk and high reward There is plenty of high risk in the tactical units. If you have success there is high reward, but if you fail, you fail big. I know there are big challenges in commanding a basic training or [advanced individual training] battalion, but it's one thing to be eating MREs at Fort Knox [Ky.,] and quite another to command troops along the border in Germany or Korea.⁸

Table 20 shows a 14.3% difference above the SP expected value for the nonselect group, which indicates a clear bias against TDA command.

TABLE 20
TYPE OF ORGANIZATION SERVED IN
AS A COMPANY/TROOP COMMANDER
(First Command)
(P < .05)

	MTOE	TDA	SP
Nonselects	89 (30.1%)	20 (46.5%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	207 (69.9%)	23 (53.5%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	296 (87.3%)	43 (12.7%)	339 (100%)

Table 21 shows that commanders who commanded a headquarters company (HHC) as their first command experienced a 10.1% higher nonselect rate than the SP expected value.

TABLE 21

LINE VERSUS HEADQUARTERS
COMPANY/TROOP COMMAND
(First Command)
(P < .025)

	Line	HHC	SP
Nonselects	68 (28.1%)	41 (42.3%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	174 (71.9%)	56 (57.7%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	242 (71.4%)	97 (28.6%)	339 (100%)

The higher nonselect rate is possibly due to placing an inexperienced commander in command of arguably the largest, most complex organization in the battalion or squadron. A headquarters company in a tank battalion has over half of the battalion's soldiers assigned to it, along with a significant portion of the battalion's equipment. The inexperience of the commander, combined with the size and complexity of a headquarters company set the stage for one or more marginal officer evaluation report ratings. Since promotion boards place special emphasis on command reports and how well an officer leads soldiers, the officer is at risk for promotion and resident command and staff college selection.⁹ Because a headquarters company is such a large and complex organization, many battalion commanders place a successful, former line company commander in command of the headquarters company.

Company/Troop Command Duration

The normal command tour length is twelve to eighteen months, except in Korea, where the typical tour length is twelve months. The study found that command tour lengths were not found to be significantly different between the two groups. Table 22 compares the first company command tour lengths between the select and nonselect groups.

TABLE 22
COMPANY COMMAND TOUR LENGTH¹⁰
(First Command)

	Selects	Nonselects
Mean	17.61	16.74
Median	18.00	17.00
Mode	18.00	17.00
Std. Deviation	6.10	4.93
Skewness	.26	-.74
Kurtosis	4.68	3.71

Skewness measures the symmetry of the data distribution on a bell-shaped curve. A value of zero indicates that the data is symmetric; a negative value indicates that the data is skewed to the left of the sample mean; a positive value indicates that the data is skewed to the right of the sample mean.¹¹

Kurtosis measures the "peakedness of the distribution of data."¹² A value of 3.0 indicates a normal distribution; a value of 1.750 indicates a flat curve, uniform distribution; values below 1.750 indicate a u-shaped curve.¹³

Operations/Executive Officer Experience

The study found that service as a battalion/squadron operations/executive officer (S3/XO) or brigade/regimental S3 was the most statistically significant predictor ($P < .0000$) in determining whether armor majors were selected or not selected to lieutenant colonel. Table 23 compares the number of officers in the SP who have not served as an S3/XO at all with the officers who served in at least one of these positions as a captain or a major for any length of time. The results clearly show that officers who did not serve in one of these key assignments were at a distinct disadvantage for promotion selection (43.9% above the SP expected value). Conversely, officers who served as an S3/XO were selected for promotion at the rate of 10.9% above the SP expected value.

TABLE 23
OPERATIONS/EXECUTIVE OFFICER EXPERIENCE
(Captain or Major)
($P \leq .0000$)

	No	Yes	SP
Nonselects	51 (76.1%)	58 (21.3%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	16 (23.9%)	214 (78.7%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	67 (19.8%)	272 (80.2%)	339 (100%)

Only 16 officers (4.7% of the SP) were selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel without first serving as an S3/XO. These officers are clearly exceptional cases where the promotion boards felt that they met the best qualified selection criterion for other compelling reasons. These reasons could include: (1) consistent exceptional manner of performance and potential for service at the next higher grade indicated on their officer evaluation reports, (2) significant functional area training and experience, and (3) unique educational qualifications such as a doctorate degree.

The study found that serving in a second S3/XO assignment also was significant. However, serving in a third, and in some cases, a fourth S3/XO assignment was not significant. Table 24 shows that of the 272 officers who served as an S3/XO ($SP_{s3/xo}$), 13 nonselectees (4.8% of the

SP_{s3/xo}, and 81 selectees (29.8% of the SP_{s3/xo}), served in a second S3/XO assignment. The nonselect group served in a single S3/XO assignment at the rate of 4% above the SP_{s3/xo} expected value. Meanwhile, the select group served in a second assignment at the rate of 7.5% above the SP_{s3/xo} expected value.

TABLE 24
ONE VERSUS TWO OPERATIONS/EXECUTIVE
OFFICER ASSIGNMENTS
(P < .05)

	1-S3/XO	2-S3/XO	SP _{s3/xo}
Nonselects	45 (25.3%)	13 (13.8%)	58 (21.3%)
Selects	133 (74.7%)	81 (86.2%)	214 (78.7%)
Total (% SP _{s3/xo})	178 (65.4%)	94 (35.6%)	272 (100%)

The likely explanation for the disparity between the two groups is that the nonselectees had a substandard manner of performance during their first S3/XO assignment, and therefore were not allowed to serve in a second S3/XO assignment. Conversely, the select group served in multiple assignments at a higher rate based on demonstrated success during previous S3/XO assignments. For example, many officers are "promoted" into a battalion XO position based on successful service at the S3.

Serving in an additional S3/XO assignment has two potential disadvantages: (1) it can deny another deserving officer the opportunity to serve in one of those critical positions, and (2) if the officer fails in the second S3/XO assignment, his earlier performance becomes largely irrelevant, and he is at risk for promotion.

However, moving proven officers to subsequent S3/XO positions can enhance unit readiness and cohesion. Consider the earlier example of moving a battalion S3 into the XO position in the same battalion. The S3 serves as a primary staff officer within the battalion staff whose primary focus is training and operational matters for the battalion. The battalion XO's responsibilities are much broader in nature and include the responsibility to supervise the efforts of the entire staff, including the S3's. If the XO has previously served as the S3, he will be familiar with how the battalion operates and will spend less time learning the staff's strengths and weaknesses than someone coming from outside the battalion. In addition, his experience in planning tactical operations will make him more effective in providing guidance to the current S3 and in synchronizing the battle for the commander.

The type of organization that an S3/XO served in was a significant predictor. Officers serving in TDA units are selected for promotion at a much lower rate than their MTOE counterparts. As a group, officers from lieutenant to

colonel who serve in TDA units are viewed as lower quality officers. A Pentagon source has said,

When you talk about combat arms, you're getting right to the heart of what the Army does and what it is all about, . . . I think the American people expect us to assign our very best officers, our proven commanders, to these [TOE] kind of jobs.¹⁴

Table 25 clearly shows this bias. Officers who served as an S3/XO in a TDA organization were nonselected at a rate 24.9% above the $SP_{s3/xo}$ expected value. Their MTOE counterparts fared much better. Their selection rate was 2.6% above the $SP_{s3/xo}$ expected value.

TABLE 25
TYPE OF ORGANIZATION SERVED IN AS AN
OPERATIONS/EXECUTIVE OFFICER
(First Assignment)
($P < .005$)

	TDA	MTOE	$SP_{s3/xo}$
Nonselects	12 (46.2%)	46 (18.7%)	58 (21.3%)
Selects	14 (53.8%)	200 (81.3%)	214 (78.7%)
Total (% $SP_{s3/xo}$)	26 (9.6%)	246 (90.4%)	272 (100%)

S3/XO Assignment Duration

The cumulative time that an officer served in an S3/XO position proved to be a significant predictor. Table 26 shows nonselects served less than the 12 month standard

at a rate 19.1% above the sample population expected value (SP_d). Conversely, 3% more of the select group served in excess of the 12 month standard than the SP_d expected value. The SP_d includes only those officers who had completed their S3/XO assignment prior to the board convene date. The 66 officers (57 selectees and 9 nonselectees) who were serving in an S3/XO position when the selection board convened were excluded from the group. The reason the study excluded these officers is that there is no indication of the number of months they would have served in an S3/XO position upon completion.

TABLE 26
OPERATIONS/EXECUTIVE OFFICER TOUR LENGTH
(First Completed Assignment)
($P < .025$)

	< 12 MOS	> 12 MOS	SP_d
Nonselects	12 (42.9%)	37 (20.8%)	49 (23.8%)
Selects	16 (57.1%)	141 (79.2%)	157 (76.2%)
Total (% SP_d)	28 (13.6%)	178 (86.4%)	206 (100%)

The disparity between the select and nonselect groups confirms the rationale related to multiple S3/XO assignments. Successful service as an S3 leads to continued service in that position or movement into a position of

greater responsibility such as an XO position. Conversely, officers who are not successful, are moved out of their S3/XO assignment and are not allowed to migrate to an S3/XO assignment of greater responsibility.

The study found a significant difference between the select and nonselect groups in the total time served as an operations/executive officer. Table 27 compares the total months served in all S3/XO assignments combined for the select and nonselect groups. Based on the earlier discussion of skewness and kurtosis, the data for the nonselect group approximates a normal distribution while the select group does not.

TABLE 27
TOTAL MONTHS SERVED AS AN OPERATIONS/EXECUTIVE
OFFICER¹⁵
(All Assignments)

	Selects	Nonselects
Mean	20.74	15.24
Median	18.00	15.50
Mode	12.00	12.00
Std. Deviation	10.21	6.19
Skewness	1.40	-.04
Kurtosis	5.38	2.77

Most Recent Troop Experience

For the purpose of this study, a troop assignment was defined as any assignment at division-level and below and did not include installation staff assignments on a one-division installation.

Officers serving in a troop assignment within twelve months of the selection board convene date enjoyed an advantage over those who did not. Table 28 shows that selectees served in a troop assignment within the last 12 months at the rate of 7.2% over the SP expected value. On the other hand, nonselects had been away from a troop assignment in excess of 12 months at the rate of 12.5% over the SP expected value.

TABLE 28
ELAPSED TIME IN MONTHS SINCE LAST TROOP ASSIGNMENT
(As of Board Convene Date)
(P < .005)

	> 12 MOS	≤ 12 MOS	SP
Nonselects	55 (44.7%)	54 (25%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	68 (55.3%)	162 (75%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	123 (36.3%)	216 (63.7%)	339 (100%)

The likely explanation for this phenomenon is that officers are either currently serving in an S3/XO assignment

or have recently left one of these assignments. The study found 66 officers (30.5% of the SP) that were serving as an S3/XO when the selection boards convened.

Joint Duty Experience

In 1986, Congress established the requirement for officers to serve in joint assignments. This law, as summarized in the Secretary of the Army's "Selection Board Instructions" establishes the following promotion selection objectives for officers who have served in, or are serving in a joint assignment: (1) officers with joint duty experience will be selected at a rate not less than other officers considered by the board who served on the Headquarters, Department of the Army Staff, (2) the selection rate for officers with joint experience will not be less than the overall selection rate for the promotion board, and (3) joint specialty officers will not be selected at a rate less than the officers serving on the Headquarters, Department of the Army Staff.¹⁶

Table 29 shows that it was an advantage to be serving in a joint assignment when the promotion boards met. The select group observed value for those serving in a joint assignment was 19.7% greater than the SP expected value. The nonselect group, who were not serving in a joint assignment when the promotion boards convened, were not selected for promotion at the rate of 3.2% over the SP expected value.

TABLE 29
OFFICERS CURRENTLY SERVING IN
A JOINT ASSIGNMENT
(As of Board Convene Date)
(P < .005)

	No	Yes	SP
Nonselects	103 (35.4%)	6 (12.5%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	188 (64.6%)	42 (87.5%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	291 (85.8%)	48 (14.2%)	339 (100%)

Although 43 officers (12.7% of the SP) had completed a joint assignment prior to the board convene date, it was not a statistically significant predictor ($P = 1.0$). Within this group, 29 officers (8.6% of the SP) were selected for promotion, 14 officers (4.1% of the SP) were not.

Other Key Jobs

The study analyzed several other broad job categories to test the Army's stated assignment philosophy that "all assignments are important assignments."¹⁷ Of the job categories analyzed within the study, only service on a brigade staff ($P < .010$) and on the USMA faculty or staff ($P < .005$) were statistically significant. Except as specifically noted under each category, officers received assignment credit in each category if they served in any position, for any length of time, and at any rank.

Brigade or Regimental Staff

Table 30 shows that the select group observed value exceeded the SP expected value by 7.2% for those that served on a brigade staff. The nonselect group observed value exceeded the SP expected value by 6.7% for those that did not serve on a brigade staff. These values are due in large part to officers serving on a brigade staff while waiting to serve as a battalion operations/executive officer.

TABLE 30
BRIGADE STAFF EXPERIENCE
(P < .010)

	No	Yes	SP
Nonselects	68 (38.9%)	41 (25%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	107 (61.1%)	123 (75%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	175 (51.6%)	164 (48.4%)	339 (100%)

Division Staff

A total of 144 officers (42.5% of the SP) had division staff experience. Of that total, 97 or 28.6% of the SP were selectees, 47 or 13.9% of the SP were nonselectees.

Corps Staff

Officers with corps staff experience totaled 41 officers (12.1% of the SP). Selectees accounted for 30 officers and 8.8% of the SP, nonselectees accounted for the remaining 11 officers and 3.2% of the SP.

Pentagon Staff

A total of 31 officers or 9.1% of the SP had served in the Pentagon. Selectees accounted for 20 officers or 5.9% of the SP. Nonselectees accounted for the remaining 11 officers and 3.2% of the SP.

PERSCOM Staff

Officers with PERSCOM staff experience totaled only 10 officers or 3% of the SP, with an equal distribution between the select and nonselect groups.

TRADOC Instructor

All Army service school instructor positions were included in this category. This category did not include ROTC instructors, TRADOC service school installation staff positions, or instructor positions at sister service schools (Navy, Air Force, Marine). A total of 76 officers or 22.4% of the SP had served as TRADOC instructors. Of that group, 51 officers or 15% of the SP were selected for promotion and 25 officers or 7.4% of the SP were not.

Combat Training Center Observer/Controller

Officers who served as a combat training center observer/controller or as a member of the opposing forces at any of the three Army combat training centers received assignment credit in this category. A total of 19 officers or 5.6% of the SP served in a combat training center observer/controller assignment. Selectees accounted for 16 officers or 4.7% of the SP, nonselectees accounted for the remaining 3 officers and .9% of the study population.

USMA Faculty and Staff

Service on the USMA faculty or staff was a positive predictor for promotion selection. This is due in large part because the USMA is designated a nominative assignment. "Nominative positions are non-troop assignments to commands that are authorized to screen potential assignees."¹⁸ It is reasonable to believe that the USMA would only select those officers who have sustained superior performance in a variety of challenging past assignments. Table 31 shows that officers who have served on the USMA faculty or staff were selected for promotion at the rate of 20.3% over the SP expected value.

TABLE 31

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY
FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERIENCE
(P < .005)

	No	Yes	SP
Nonselects	104 (35%)	5 (11.9%)	109 (32.2%)
Selects	193 (65%)	37 (88.1%)	230 (67.8%)
Total (% SP)	297 (87.6%)	42 (12.4%)	339 (100%)

Reserve Officer Training Corps

ROTC assignments are also considered nominative assignments.¹⁹ Officers serving in any capacity within ROTC Cadet Command received assignment credit for this category. Some officers have asserted that serving in one of the "three Rs" (ROTC, Recruiting Command, and Reserve Component support) is detrimental to an officer's career. The study's evidence does not support this assertion. Service in a ROTC assignment was not a statistically significant predictor for or against promotion selection. A total of 90 officers or 26.5% of the SP served in a ROTC assignment. Of that group, 56 officers or 16.5% were selectees, 34 officers or 10% of the SP were nonselectees.

United States Army Recruiting Command

United States Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) assignments are also nominative assignments, however, they

were not significant promotion predictors.²⁰ A total of 24 officers or 7.1% of the SP served in a USAREC assignment. Of that total, 17 officers and 5% of the SP were selectees, nonselectees accounted for the remaining 7 officers and 2.1% of the study population.

Reserve Component Support

Reserve Component (RC) support positions were not found to be a statistically significant predictor. A total of 55 officers and 16.2% of the SP served in RC support positions. Of that population, 34 officers or 10% of the SP were selectees, 21 officers and the remaining 6.2% of the SP were nonselectees.

The Hypotheses

The study's null hypothesis stated that no difference could be found between a common pattern of discriminators for the select and nonselect groups. The previous ORB analysis results provide sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

The first underlying hypothesis stated that there would be a common pattern of discriminators for armor majors selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel. There is sufficient evidence to accept this hypothesis. The study revealed 13 predictors associated with selection to lieutenant colonel that were less than or equal to the predictors based on their significance levels.

TABLE 32
SELECTEE PROMOTION PREDICTORS

Rank	Predictor	Sig. Level
1.	S3/XO assignment	$P \leq .0000$
2.	USMA faculty	$P < .005$
3.	Serving joint assignment	$P < .005$
4.	USMA graduate	$P < .005$
5.	Resident MEL 4	$P < .005$
6.	Time away from troops	$P < .005$
7.	MTOE S3/XO	$P < .005$
8.	FA 49	$P < .025$
9.	Line company first command	$P < .025$
10.	S3/XO assignment duration	$P < .025$
11.	FA 41	$P < .05$
12.	Second S3/XO assignment	$P < .05$
13.	MTOE company command	$P < .05$

The second underlying hypothesis stated that armor majors not selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel would show a common pattern of discriminators that was different from the select group. There is sufficient evidence to accept this hypothesis as well. The study revealed 10 predictors for nonselection to lieutenant colonel that were less than or equal to the .05 level of

significance. Table 33 rank-orders these predictors based on their significance levels.

TABLE 33
NONSELECTEE PREDICTORS

Rank	Predictor	Sig. Level
1.	No S3/XO assignment	$P \leq .0000$
2.	No MEL 4	$P < .005$
3.	TDA S3/XO assignment	$P < .005$
4.	Time away from troops	$P < .005$
5.	Nonresident MEL 4	$P < .005$
6.	ROTC non-DMG graduate	$P < .005$
7.	FA 92	$P < .025$
8.	S3/XO assignment duration	$P < .025$
9.	HHC first command	$P < .025$
10.	TDA first command	$P < .05$

Past Policy Comparison

This section will compare the educational and assignment policies in force during the FYs 1990-1992 lieutenant colonel promotion selection boards with the selection board results to determine the level of compliance with established Army policy.

Military Education

In his "Selection Board Instructions," the Secretary of the Army directed that, "The board will not establish selection for or attendance at Command and General Staff College (CSC) or equivalent as a criterion for selection for promotion."²¹ The "Armor Branch" chapter in the 1989 version of DA PAM 600-3 states that armor majors, "Should be selected for attendance to CGSC or its equivalent, or be enrolled in a non-resident CGSC MEL 4)."²²

Although The promotion board results showed a bias against those officers who complete the Nonresident CGSOC, failure to obtain a MEL 4 education almost certainly assured nonselection for all but seven officers. The results of the 1992 CSC Selection Board indicate that the Army intends to expand resident CSC opportunities under "a new policy designed to provide a 60 percent selection opportunity for officer year groups during the drawdown."²³ This increase will ease the bias for approximately 10% more of the officers in any given year group. However, this policy also has the potential to make the apparent bias against the officers who complete the Nonresident CGSOC more acute.

Operational Assignments

Army policy contained in the FYs 1990-1992 "Selection Board Instructions" stated that the "Army's assignment philosophy is that all assignments are important assignments."²⁴ The study results indicate that this is

generally true. However, the results also indicate that:

- (1) line company command is better than headquarters company command,
- (2) serving as an S3/XO increases an officer's promotion potential while not serving in one of those positions places an officer at significant risk, and
- (3) serving in an MTOE unit is better than serving in a TDA unit.

The high number of selectees who have served as an S3/XO (214 officers out of 230 selectees or 93%) indicate that the Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection boards are holding armor majors to DA PAM 600-3 standards.

Has the S3/XO requirement placed armor majors at a disadvantage? The 3-year promotion board results show that approximately 80% of the officers in the study population managed to serve as an operations/executive officer. This figure included a 15 to 20 month total assignment duration and over 30% of the officers serving in more than one S3/XO assignment. If one considers the DOPMA goal of a 70% selection rate to lieutenant colonel as fair, then the S3/XO requirement is by definition fair. The Armor Proponent estimates that there will be approximately a 77% opportunity for armor majors to serve a minimum of 12 months in an S3 or XO assignment in the future.²⁵

Perhaps the larger issue is "fairness" to unit readiness. Consider the armor major serving on a brigade staff who is waiting for the opportunity to serve as an S3/XO. Since the number of S3/XO positions are limited, it is reasonable to believe that commanders are reserving them

for officers who have demonstrated the potential for increased responsibility. If an armor major performs poorly in his present job, his brigade commander will not provide him the opportunity to serve as an S3/XO. Since commanders are responsible for their unit's readiness, they are in the best position to determine who is allowed to serve in these critical jobs. This informal selection process helps to provide the unit and its soldiers the best possible leadership, thus maintaining unit readiness.

Stating the standards that selection boards expect of the Army's officers in DA PAM 600-3 is ultimately fair to the officer corps. Clear, unequivocal standards allow officers to make informed career decisions as the Army executes its drawdown plans. An armor major not selected to serve as an S3/XO as in the example above would realize that he is at risk for promotion to lieutenant colonel as an armor officer. The officer can then make an informed choice to single-track in his functional area, continue to compete for promotion as an armor officer, or take advantage of one of the Army's separation incentives. If the S3/XO requirement is not clearly stated as a requirement for promotion, the officer will continue to believe he is competitive for promotion when in fact he is at great risk.

Army policy directs that officers with joint duty experience be selected at a rate not less than the overall board selection rate. The study results indicate that the selection boards have complied with that directive.

The "Selection Board Instructions" ask that the selection boards give "appropriate consideration" to officers serving in RC support, ROTC, USAREC, and USMA assignments.²⁶ Since RC support, ROTC, and USAREC, assignments were not found to be statistically significant predictors, selection or nonselection is not dependent on these assignment variables. Service on the USMA faculty or staff was a significant predictor for promotion selection, second only to serving as an S3/XO.

The Secretary of the Army has stated that the Army will not penalize officers who did not participate in combat. The study results show that combat experience did not have a significant influence on promotion selection. The selection rates for officers with combat experience approximated the overall armor major promotion selection rate.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has established promotion predictors for selection and nonselection to lieutenant colonel, and has compared these predictors with Army policy. Did the Fiscal Years 1990-1992 Lieutenant Colonel Promotion Selection Board results comply with established policy? Yes, for the vast majority of armor majors considered in the primary selection zone of consideration.

CHAPTER 5

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations apply to the policy contained in DA PAM 600-3 and Army promotion criteria.

1. Eliminate the two-tiered qualification system in the future versions of DA PAM 600-3. The study results show that service as an S3/XO and a MEL 4 education are requirements for promotion to lieutenant colonel. Since the "Selection Board Instructions" do not require the board to strictly follow the requirements in DA PAM 600-3, it should be used as a vehicle to honestly articulate the standards for the best qualified selection criterion to the officers in the field. If the standards are clear and stated up-front, officers in the field can make informed career decisions in this era of uncertainty.

2. Given the first recommendation, the Center for Army Leadership should rescind the policy of standardizing branch chapters in DA PAM 600-3. This will allow each branch proponent the opportunity to honestly portray unique branch requirements based on their warfighting needs and selection board requirements.

3. The Army should formally establish MEL 4 completion as a prerequisite for promotion to lieutenant colonel.

Formally establishing this requirement in DA PAM 600-3 honestly articulates the educational standard that the promotion selection boards will hold the Army's majors to in order to be selected for promotion. Additionally, since all officers have access to a MEL 4 education through either the resident or nonresident option, there is little reason for officers to not complete this important educational program.

4. Continue the policy of a 60% selection goal to resident CSC attendance after the Army completes the drawdown. Although the study showed that failure to complete a MEL 4 program virtually assured nonselection to lieutenant colonel, it also showed a bias towards those officers who completed the nonresident course as their only source of MEL 4 credit.

5. The Army should direct that all functional area proponents establish specific, detailed standards that officers must meet in order to remain fully qualified in their functional area.

6. The Army should examine the feasibility of a single-track option in all functional areas and the combat arms branches. Currently, FA 48--foreign area officer, FA 50--force development, and FA 54--operations, plans and training, do not allow single-tracking. The remaining functional areas have a single-track option. All armor majors will not be afforded the opportunity to serve in an S3/XO assignment. Those officers who are not afforded the opportunity to serve as an S3/XO must single track in their

functional area in order to be competitive for promotion. However, if the officer holds FAs 48, 50, or 54, that option is not open to him.

7. Change the current Army policy to allow branch proponents to brief selection boards on their branch's unique requirements. Currently, officer selection board members representing each branch brief the other members of the selection board on their unique branch or functional area requirements and career patterns during the pre-board preparation process. Although these officers use DA PAM 600-3 as a guide to brief the board, the branch proponent is better qualified to brief for the following reasons: (1) branch proponents wrote their particular branch or functional area chapter in DA PAM 600-3 and are in a better position to answer questions on unique branch or functional area requirements and career patterns, (2) proponents are responsible for developing branch leader development policy through the Branch Commandant, and (3) proponents closely track MTOE, TDA authorizations for their branch and are in a better position to estimate key assignment opportunities. Currently the proponents are allowed to brief enlisted promotion and school selection boards.

8. The Armor Proponent should continue to analyze selection board results to assess policy compliance with current policies and to serve as a basis for appropriate changes to DA PAM 600-3.

Proposed Topics for Future Study

1. Conduct a similar study for other combat arms branches, compare the results to armor's results.
2. Survey selection boards to determine the relative weight they give to manner of performance, education and assignment qualifications, and physical fitness and military bearing during the board deliberations.
3. Determine the reasons behind the apparent TDA bias.
4. Determine the reasons behind the apparent Nonresident CGSOC bias.
5. Determine if the S3/XO requirement meets Army needs.
6. Determine the specific warfighting skills, knowledge, and attitudes for command. Does an S3/XO requirement builds these skills?
7. Examine the feasibility of establishing a separate command and staff track for officers.
8. Conduct a follow-up study in the future after the transition to new Army end-strength levels and personnel strength stability is achieved.

ENDNOTES

Chapter 1

¹Colin L. Powell, The National Military Strategy of the United States (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1992), 8.

²Michael P. W. Stone, memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1992 Lieutenant Colonel, Army, Promotion Selection Board, "Selection Board Instructions," 20 April 1992, TDS, Washington, DC, 1. (Cited hereafter as Stone, "Board Instructions.") Instructions to the FYs 1990 and 1991 selection boards nearly identical in content.

³ibid., encl. 2, 2.

⁴Stephen E. Wilson, "Ruminations of a Branch Chief," Armor, 100 (September-October 1991): 42.

⁵Tom Leet, Armor Proponency office, telephone interview by author, 6 October 1992, notes in possession of author.

⁶U.S. Army, "Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3, Officer Professional Development and Utilization," Final Draft, Unedited (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1992), 9. Page number is from the Armor Proponent submission.

⁷ibid. 10.

⁸CPT(P) Tim Coffin, CGSOC student, interview by author, 4 March 1993, Fort Leavenworth, KS, notes in possession of author. (Cited hereafter as Coffin, Interview.) CPT(P) Coffin's previous assignment was with the DA Secretariat for Selection Boards. Among his duties was to serve as a selection board recorder.

⁹Stone, "Board Instructions," encl. 1, 3.

¹⁰ibid., encl. 2, 2.

¹¹ibid., encl. 1, 4.

¹² Ibid., 1.

¹³ Ibid., encl. 1, 5-6.

¹⁴ U.S. Total Army Personnel Command, "Centralized Selection System Overview," n.d., briefing, U.S. Total Army Personnel Command, Alexandria, VA.

¹⁵ Coffin, Interview.

¹⁶ Stone, "Board Instructions," encl. 1, 5-6.

¹⁷ Ibid., encl. 1, 6.

¹⁸ Ibid., encl. 1, 7.

¹⁹ U.S. Army, Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3, Officer Professional Development and Utilization (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1989), 26.

²⁰ U.S. Army Armor Center, Armor Officer Professional Development Guide (Fort Knox, KY: Department of the Army, 1992), C-1.

²¹ Ibid., C-1.

²² Stone, "Board Instructions," encl., 1.

²³ W. Edward Ward, memo to author, "OER Data Request for MMAS Thesis," n.d., TDS, document in possession of author.

Chapter 2

¹ J. N. Christianson, memo to Selected Commanders, "FY 1990 Promotion List for Lieutenant Colonel, Army Competitive Category," 18 September 1990, TDS, Alexandria, VA, encl. 5, 1. (Cited hereafter as Christianson, "1990 Promotion List.") The information was gathered in a like manner following the FY 1991 and 1992 promotion boards.

² Christianson, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; J. N. Christianson, memo to Selected Commanders, "FY 1991 Promotion List for Lieutenant Colonel, Army Competitive Category," 3 September 1991, TDS, Alexandria, VA, encl. 5, pt. 4. (Cited hereafter as Christianson, "1991 Promotion List."); Michael J. Veasey, memo to Selected Commanders, "FY 92 Promotion List for Lieutenant Colonel, Army Competitive Category," 10 July 1992, TDS, Alexandria, VA, encl. 5, pt. 4. (Cited hereafter as Veasey, "1990 Promotion List.")

³Christianson, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; Christianson, "1991 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; Veasey, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4.

⁴Christianson, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; Christianson, "1991 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; Veasey, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4.

⁵Christianson, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; Christianson, "1991 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4; Veasey, "1990 Promotion List," encl. 5, pt. 4.

⁶Author served as the Chief, Officer Management Branch, Armor Proponency Office, Fort Knox, KY. This office conducted selection list analyses for the command and staff college, senior service college, lieutenant colonel and colonel promotion and command selection lists. Results are normally kept on file for three years.

⁷Dennis H. Long, memo to Commander, USAARMC, "Information Paper - FY91 Lieutenant Colonel Selection List Analysis," 7 November 1991, TDS, Fort Knox, KY, encls. 4-5. (Cited hereafter as Long, "Armor LTC Analysis.")

⁸U.S. Army Armor Center, Armor Officer Professional Development Guide (Fort Knox, KY: Department of the Army, 1988), 4-1. (Cited hereafter as USAARMC, AOPD, 1988.)

⁹Long, "Armor LTC Analysis," encls. 4-5.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, encls. 4-5.

¹¹*Ibid.*, encls. 4-5.

¹²*Ibid.*, encls. 4-5.

¹³*Ibid.*, encls. 4-5.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, encls. 4-5.

¹⁵U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Officer Promotion Program, Department of Defense Directive Number 1320.12 (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 3 June 1987), 5.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁷Michael P. W. Stone, memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1992 Lieutenant Colonel, Army, Promotion Selection Board, "Selection Board Instructions," 20 April 1992, TDS, Washington, DC, encl. 2, 1.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, encl. 2, 1-2.

¹⁹ Ibid., encl. 2, 2.

²⁰ U.S. Army, Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3, Officer Professional Development and Utilization (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1989), 26.

²¹ USAARMC, AOPD, 1988, 4-6.

²² U.S. Army Armor Center, Armor Officer Professional Development Guide (Fort Knox, KY: Department of the Army, 1992), 4-6. (Cited hereafter as USAARMC, AOPD, 1992.)

²³ Branch proponent action officer working group meeting with the Center for Army Leadership, March 1992. Consensus could not be reached between the representatives present. Author was one of two Armor Proponent action officers present.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ U.S. Army, "Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3, Officer Professional Development and Utilization," Final Draft, Unedited (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1992), 9. Page number is from the Armor Proponent submission.

²⁶ Ibid., 9.

²⁷ William C. Dorman and R. Bruce Haverty, "Branch Qualification of Armor Majors," TD, Fort Knox, KY, Armor Proponency Office, 1, 9, 12.

²⁸ Albert N. Garland, "Officers Career Notes," Infantry 81 (May-June 1991): 46.

²⁹ Ibid., 47.

³⁰ Albert N. Garland, "Officers Career Notes," Infantry 81 (September-October 1991): 46.

Chapter 3

¹ William Mendenhall, Lyman Ott, and Richard F. Larson, Statistics: A Tool for the Social Sciences, (North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1974), 373.

²U.S. Army Armor Center, Armor Officer Professional Development Guide (Fort Knox, KY: Department of the Army, 1992), 3-7. (Cited hereafter as USAARMC, AOPD, 1992.) Total armor officer FA inventory listed as 3,052 officers, 409 in FA 41, 489 in FA 51, and 1042 in FA 54. Officers do not receive their FA designation until their fifth or sixth year of AFCS, therefore the total inventory figure does not include lieutenants and junior captains.

³J. C. Lind, ed., "Major Recommendations to Modify OPMS," Commanders Call 1 (September-October 1984): 21.

⁴USAARMC, AOPD, 1992, 4-5.

⁵Michael P. W. Stone, memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1992 Lieutenant Colonel, Army, Promotion Selection Board, "Selection Board Instructions," 20 April 1992, TDS, Washington, DC, encl. 2, 1.

Chapter 4

¹William Mendenhall, Lyman Ott, and Richard F. Larson, Statistics: A Tool for the Social Sciences, (North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1974), 373.

²U.S. Army Armor Center, Armor Officer Professional Development Guide (Fort Knox, KY: Department of the Army, 1988), 2-1. (Cited hereafter as USAARMC, AOPD, 1988.) The 1992 version shows that armor accesses approximately 36% USMA, 54% ROTC, and 10% of its lieutenants from the OCS.

³USAARMC, AOPD, 1988, 4-1.

⁴U.S. Army Armor Center, Armor Officer Professional Development Guide (Fort Knox, KY: Department of the Army, 1992), A-3. (Cited hereafter as USAARMC, AOPD, 1992.)

⁵*Ibid.*, A-3.

⁶*Ibid.*, A-3.

⁷Michael P. W. Stone, memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1992 Lieutenant Colonel, Army, Promotion Selection Board, "Selection Board Instructions," 20 April 1992, TDS, Washington, DC, encl. 2, 1. (Cited hereafter as Stone, "Board Instructions," 1992.)

⁸Jim Tice, "Kiss of Death [--] Training Jobs Kill Combat Commander's Careers," Army Times, 16 March 1992, 8. (Cited hereafter as Tice, "Kiss of Death.")

⁹USAARMC, AOPD, 1992, C-1.

¹⁰Military Applications Program Package (MAPP), Combined Arms Center, Fort Leavenworth, KS. (Cited hereafter as MAPP.)

¹¹ibid.

¹²ibid.

¹³ibid.

¹⁴Tice, "Kiss of Death," 3.

¹⁵MAPP.

¹⁶Stone, "Board Instructions,"1992, encl 2, 11.

¹⁷Stone, "Board Instructions,"1992, encl 2, 1.

¹⁸Stephen E. Wilson, "Ruminations of a Branch Chief," Armor, 100 (September-October 1991): 44.

¹⁸ibid., 44.

²⁰ibid., 44.

²¹Stone, "Board Instructions,"1992, encl 2, 3.

²²U.S. Army, Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3, Officer Professional Development and Utilization (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1989), 26.

²³Jim Tice, "Command and Staff College Admissions Total 964," Army Times, 1 March 1993, 10.

²⁴Stone, "Board Instructions,"1992, encl 2, 1.

²⁵USAARMC, AOPD, 1992, 4-2.

²⁶Stone, "Board Instructions,"1992, encl 2, 9-10.

GLOSSARY

Active Federal Commissioned Service. The active duty service as an officer in the Armed Forces, expressed in years and months.

Branch Immaterial Position. Any documented position that does not require an officer of a specific accession branch.

Branch Position. Any documented position that requires an officer of a specific accession branch.

Branch Qualification. An established standard that normally consists of a combination of educational requirements and successful completion of one or more branch-specific assignments. Achieving this standard renders an officer fully qualified for promotion to the next higher grade.

COHORT Year Group. A group of officers commissioned during the same fiscal year and are usually considered for promotion at the same time.

Dual-tracked Officer. An officer who serves repetitive assignments in both his or her branch and functional area.

Functional Area. A career field other than an accession branch that usually requires significant education, training and experience. Most officers receive their FA designation between their 5th and 6th year of AFCS.

Institutional Training. Formal military schools conducted by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and selected civilian institutions.

Operational Assignment. Any assignment or duties, other than as a student, within the Department of Defense.

Opportunity Rates. The cumulative opportunity, expressed in a percentage, that a given group of officers could potentially serve in a specific operational assignment for a given amount of time.

Other Assignment. Any assignment not coded armor. For the purposes of this study, this category includes officers serving in FA and immaterial positions and in the THS account.

Predominate Year Group. The COHORT YG whose officers make up the majority of the officers in the zone of consideration for a selection board.

Primary Zone. That group of officers whose date of rank and year group constitute the majority of officers considered for promotion by a promotion board.

Selection Board. The group of officers brought together for the specific purpose of determining which officers to promote, send to certain formal military schools, or to involuntarily separate from military service.

Single-track Officer. An officer who holds only one branch or functional area and serves repetitive assignments in that career field only.

S3/X0. Officers serving in any one or a combination of the following assignments: battalion or squadron S3 or X0, brigade or regimental S3.

Transient, Hospital, and School Account. Usually expressed as a percentage of total branch inventory. Officers in this assignment category are between change of station moves, in a medical facility for treatment, or enrolled in a civilian or military school for an extended period.

Troop Assignment. Any assignment at division-level and below. Does not include installation staff positions on a one-division post.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Books

- Freund, John E. Modern Elementary Statistics. 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Mendenhall, William, Lyman Ott, and Richard F. Larson. Statistics: A Tool for the Social Sciences. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1974.
- SPSS, Inc. SPSS X Basics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Westmeyer, Paul. A Guide for Use in Planning and Conducting Research Projects. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1981.

Computer Software

- Military Applications Program Package. Combined Arms Center, Fort Leavenworth, KS.
- Question&Answer Version 2.0. Symantec Corporation, Cupertino, CA.
- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL.

Congressional and Executive Department Documents

- U.S. Congress. U.S. Code, Title 10, Defense Officer Personnel Management Act. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1983.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel. Department of Defense Officer Promotion Procedures. 100th Congress, 2nd sess., 3 March 1988, Committee Print.
- Stone, Hon. Michael P. W. "Selection Board Instructions." Memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1990 Lieutenant Colonel, Army, Promotion Board, TDS. Department of Defense, Washington, DC, 11 June 1990.

Stone, Hon. Michael P. W. "Selection Board Instructions."
Memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1991 Lieutenant
Colonel, Army, Promotion Board, TDS. Department of
Defense, Washington, DC, 6 May 1991.

Stone, Hon. Michael P. W. "Selection Board Instructions."
Memo to the President, Fiscal Year 1992 Lieutenant
Colonel, Army, Promotion Board, TDS. Department of
Defense, Washington, DC, 20 April 1992.

U.S. Department of Defense. Defense Officer Promotion
Program, Department of Defense Directive Number
1320.12. Washington, DC: Department of Defense,
28 March 1983.

Department of the Army Memorandums

Christianson, J. N. "FY 1990 Promotion List for Lieutenant
Colonel, Army Competitive Category." Memo to Selected
Commanders, TDS. U.S. Total Army Personnel Command,
Alexandria, VA, 18 September 1990.

_____. "FY 1991 Promotion List for Lieutenant Colonel,
Army Competitive Category." Memo to Selected
Commanders, TDS. U.S. Total Army Personnel Command,
Alexandria, VA, 3 September 1991.

Long, Dennis H. "Information Paper - FY91 Lieutenant
Colonel Selection List Analysis." Memo to Commander,
USAARMC, TDS. U.S. Army Armor Center, Fort Knox, KY,
7 November 1991.

Veasey, Michael J. "FY 92 Promotion List for Lieutenant
Colonel, Army Competitive Category." Memo to Selected
Commanders, TDS. U.S. Total Army Personnel Command,
Alexandria, VA, 10 July 1992.

Department of the Army Pamphlets

U.S. Army. Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3,
Commissioned Officer Professional Development and
Utilization. Washington, DC: Department of the Army,
1989.

_____. "Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3, Officer
Professional Development and Utilization." Final Draft.
Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1992.

_____. Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-32, Leader
Development for the Total Army. The Enduring Legacy.
Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1991.

Other Government Documents and Working Papers

Dorman, William C. and R. Bruce Haverty. "Branch Qualification of Armor Majors." U.S. Army Armor Center Position Paper, Fort Knox, KY, 16 December 1991.

OPMS Study Group briefing presented to the OPMS General Officer Steering Committee, 6-7 June 1984. Combined Arms Research Library, Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS.

U.S. Army Armor Center. Armor Officer Professional Development Guide. U.S. Army Armor Center, Fort Knox, KY, 1988.

_____. Armor Officer Professional Development Guide. U.S. Army Armor Center, Fort Knox, KY, 1992.

U.S. Army Total Army Personnel Command. "Centralized Selection System Overview." Briefing. U.S. Total Army Personnel Command, Alexandria, VA, n.d.

_____. Leader opportunity rate formula. Armor Functional Review briefing for Lieutenant General Reno, U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, December 1991.

Periodicals

Anastasio, Michael A. "Leader Development Direction for the Future." Military Review 71 (May 1991): 10-19.

Garland, Albert N., ed. "Officers Career Notes." Infantry 81 (May-June 1991): 46-47.

_____. "Officers Career Notes." Infantry 81 (September-October 1991): 48.

Knowlton, William A., Jr. "Military Qualification Standards: An Officer Leader Development Tool." Military Review 71 (May 1991): 34-41.

_____. "OPMS: Flawed, But Fixable." Army 39 (January 1989): 12-17.

Morley, Thomas V. "Too Important to Ignore: Training Field Grade Officers in Units." Military Review 71 (January 1991): 50-61.

Wilson, Stephen E. "Ruminations of a Branch Chief." Armor 100 (September-October 1991): 41-49.

Personal Contacts

Author's phone conversations with Mr. Tom Leet,
Armor Proponency Office, Fort Knox, KY, September 1992.

Coffin, Tim, CGSOC Student. Interview by author,
4 March, 1993, notes in possession of author.

Leet, Tom. Phone Interview by author, 6 October 1992,
notes in possession of author.

Author's phone conversations with Mr. Tom Leet,
Armor Proponency Office, Fort Knox, KY,
November 1992 through April 1993.

Special Studies and Reports

McLesky, Dr. James J. "The U.S. Army Professional
Development of Officers Study: A Critique." Individual
essay, U.S. Army War College, 1986.

U.S. Army. Professional Development of Officers Study.
5 vols. Vol. 4: "Development Periods." Washington,
DC: Department of the Army, 1985.

_____. Professional Development of Officers Study.
5 vols. Vol. 5: "Policy Impact Analysis."
Washington, DC: Department of the Army, n.d.

U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Leader
Development Action Plan. Fort Leavenworth, KS:
Department of the Army, 1988.

_____. Leader Development Study. Fort Leavenworth, KS:
Department of the Army, 1988.

Unpublished Papers and Theses

Goring, R. H. "Leadership in Peace and War: Are There
Differences and the Impact on Leader Development."
Study Project, U.S. Army War College, 1990.

Kluever, Emil K., William L. Lynch, Michael T. Matthies,
Thomas L. Owens, and John A. Spears. "Striking a
Balance in Leader Development: A Case for Conceptual
Competence." National Security Program Discussion Paper
Series, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of
Government, Cambridge, MA, 1992.

Pizzano, B. V. "Senior Leadership Wartime Skills."
Study Project, U.S. Army War College, 1989.

Thompson, William R. "A Flow Model of the U.S. Army Field
Grade Officer Corps to Produce the Five Year Promotion
Plan." Masters Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 1985.

Waterman, Richard E. "Perceptions of Successful Field Grade
Officers Concerning the Retention Impact of Selected
Army Programs and Policies." Study Project, U.S. Army
War College, 1987.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
2. Defense Technical Information Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314
3. Lieutenant Colonel Steven R. Lindberg
109 Forrest Drive
Holden, MA 01520
4. Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Crafton
Office of the Director, CGSS
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
5. Major Bruce A. Leeson
3032 Grand Avenue
Kansas City, MO 64108
6. Commander, USAARMC & Fort Knox
ATTN: ATZK-CG
Fort Knox, KY 40121
7. Commander, USAARMC & Fort Knox
ATTN: ATZK-ARP
Fort Knox, KY 40121
8. Mr. Tom Leet
48 Hilltop Road
Floyd's Knobs, IN 47119
9. Lieutenant Colonel Michael F. Keohane
Center for Army Leadership
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
10. Major William C. Dorman
200 Elmwood Drive
Elizabethtown, KY 42701